arXiv:math/0611554v4 [math.RT] 24 Jun 2008

GOOD PRODUCT EXPANSIONS FOR TAME ELEMENTS OF p-ADIC GROUPS

JEFFREY D. ADLER AND LOREN SPICE

ABSTRACT. We show that, under fairly general conditions, many elements of a p-adic group can be well approximated by a product whose factors have properties that are helpful in performing explicit character computations.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction 1
2. Some assumptions 5
3. Preliminaries 7
4. Tameness and compatible filtration 19
5. Groups associated to concave functions 27
6. Normal approximations: basic definitions 45
7. Good elements and commutators 50
8. Existence and uniqueness of normal approximations 59
9. Normal approximations and conjugation 64

Appendix A. Generalities on reductive groups 74
Appendix B. Generalities on concave functions 80
Index of notation 85
Index of terminology 85
References 86

1. INTRODUCTION

Suppose F is a non-discrete, discretely valued, locally compact field of residual characteristic p with valuation ord, ϖ is a uniformizer of F, and $\mathfrak{f}$ is the residue field of F. (We will weaken these hypotheses on F below.

Date: 30 May, 2008.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 20G25, 22E35. Secondary 22E50.

The first-named author was partially supported by the National Security Agency (H98230-05-1-0251 and H98230-07-1-002) and by a University of Akron Faculty Research Grant (#1604). The second-named author was supported by National Science Foundation Postdoctoral Fellowship award DMS-0503107.

See especially §3.2.) Each element of $\mathfrak{f}$ is a coset in the ring of integers of F of the unique maximal ideal in that ring. The set $\mathcal{S}$ consisting of 0 and the roots of unity in F of order coprime to p is a set of coset representatives for $\mathfrak{f}$. Then every element $\gamma \in F^\times$ has a unique expression of the form

$$\gamma = \sum_{i=\operatorname{ord}(\gamma)}^{\infty} \delta_i \varpi^i$$

with $\delta_i \in \mathcal{S}$ for $i \geq \operatorname{ord}(\gamma)$. For some purposes, it turns out to be more convenient to work with expressions of the form

$$\gamma = \varepsilon_0 \varpi^{\operatorname{ord}(\gamma)} \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} (1 + \varepsilon_i \varpi^i),$$

where $\varepsilon_i \in \mathcal{S}$ for $i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$. Of course, the terms in this product all commute with each other.

More generally, suppose D is a central division algebra of degree n over F. From Proposition I.4.5 of [47], D has a uniformizer ϖ_D such that $\varpi_D^n = \varpi$, and there is a set $\mathcal{S}$ of coset representatives for the quotient of the ring of integers of D by its unique maximal ideal such that every element $\gamma \in D^\times$ has an expansion of the form

$$(*) \qquad \gamma = \varepsilon_0 \varpi_D^{\operatorname{ord}_D(\gamma)} \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} (1 + \varepsilon_i \varpi_D^i),$$

where ord_D is the unique valuation on D extending $n \cdot \operatorname{ord}$ on F, and $\varepsilon_i \in \mathcal{S}$ for $i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$. When the degree n is coprime to p, then as observed in [14], every element $\gamma \in D^\times$ is conjugate to one for which the factors in $(*)$ all commute with each other. (Such elements are called *normal* in [2]. This is the motivation for our term '*normal approximation*' in Definition 6.8 below.) Then, for $r = 1, 2, \ldots$, it is natural to consider the truncation

$$\gamma_{<r} := \varepsilon_0 \varpi_D^{\operatorname{ord}_D(\gamma)} \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} (1 + \varepsilon_i \varpi_D^i).$$

In general, $\gamma_{<r}$ is "more singular" than γ (i.e., has larger centralizer). Although the specific element $\gamma_{<r}$ depends on the choice of uniformizer ϖ_D, it turns out that the division algebra $C_D(\gamma_{<r})$ is independent of this choice.

If the degree n of D is prime and π is a representation of $D^\times$ which is trivial on the rth filtration subgroup of $D^\times$, then $\gamma_{<r}$ is either central or regular, a dichotomy that is reflected in the differing formulæ for the character $\Theta_\pi(\gamma)$ in each case. Whether or not n is prime, the division algebras which arise as centralizers of truncations of γ play an important role in the character formulæ of [2] (specifically, see §4 of loc. cit.).

As the character theory of reductive p-adic groups is still in its early stages, there are not many explicit supercuspidal character formulæ available, but a number of qualitative results have been proven. Supercuspidal characters have been computed for $\mathrm{SL}_2(F)$ in [36]; for $\mathrm{PGL}_2(F)$ in [41]; and for $\mathrm{GL}_2(F)$ in [40]. In these cases, the character tables are complete, but it is necessary to place some restriction on the residual characteristic of the underlying field F, usually that it be odd. Under similar conditions, complete character tables are available for $\mathrm{GL}_3(F)$ in [15]. Further explicit information is known for supercuspidal characters of $\mathrm{GL}_\ell(F)$ and $\mathrm{SL}_\ell(F)$ with ℓ prime (see [14], [15], [24], and [42]); $\mathrm{GL}_n(F)$ (see [2] and [31]) and $\mathrm{SL}_n(F)$ (see [30]) with n not necessarily prime; and $\mathrm{Sp}_4(F)$ (see [6]). In all of these latter cases, we must place a restriction on the residual characteristic p of F, and the actual character tables are not yet complete. The most detailed information that is available is for the so-called "unramified supercuspidal representations" of $\mathrm{GL}_\ell(F)$.

The calculations in [18] (see Proposition 7.4), [14], [15], and [42] have suggested that, since many supercuspidal representations are induced from compact modulo center groups, precise control over the terms appearing in (some analogue of) the Frobenius formula for induced characters will be an important tool in the computation of characters of such representations. To this end, it is necessary to have a precise understanding of the effect of conjugation on a regular semisimple element.

Implicit in the above-mentioned papers, and explicit in the calculations underlying [2], is the idea of a truncation of an element of a general or special linear group, or of a division algebra (as described above). In order to compute character formulæ for other groups, we need to generalize this notion, hence to express an element as an infinite product in a convenient way. This is the main goal of the present paper.

In order for a product expansion to converge, the terms should lie in smaller and smaller subgroups in some filtration of G. There is a canonical filtration when $G = D^\times$, but not in general. In [28] and [29], Moy and Prasad defined a collection of filtrations of G, which will play the same role for us. In fact, we need a slight generalization of the Moy–Prasad filtrations; so, following Yu in [48], in §5 we define filtration subgroups associated to certain functions on the root system of our group.

In our forthcoming paper [5], we will apply the structure theory results of this paper to compute the values at elements γ as above of the characters of many of the supercuspidal representations constructed by Yu in [48].

We now outline the content of this paper. We no longer suppose that F is locally compact. We will assume for simplicity that it is complete and has perfect residue field, but this is not the most general possible condition under which our results hold (see §3.2). Let $\mathbf{G}$ denote a connected, reductive F-group, and G its group of F-rational points.

In §2, we describe the hypotheses under which we work in this paper. Not all of our results require all hypotheses, so we describe precisely where in the document each assumption is used.

In §3, we recall some basic definitions and notation, especially regarding Moy–Prasad filtrations and the Bruhat–Tits building. Since we are working over very general fields, we also re-prove some results about Moy–Prasad filtrations which are familiar in the case where F is locally compact.

In §4, we introduce the notion of *compatibly filtered* subgroups. These are F-subgroups of $\mathbf{G}$ for which both the Bruhat–Tits buildings and the Moy–Prasad filtrations sit nicely inside the associated objects for $\mathbf{G}$. This notion is a mild generalization of that of a tame Levi subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$ (see Lemmata 3.7 and 3.8). The principal results of this section, Proposition 4.6 and Corollary 4.8, show that the centralizer of a truncation of a tame-modulo-center element of G is compatibly filtered. (This centralizer need not, in general, be a Levi subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$.)

In [48, §§1–2], Yu defined filtration subgroups of G associated to certain functions on the root system of $\mathbf{G}$. However, Yu's subgroups are best behaved only when the ambient group $\mathbf{G}$ is tame. Since we wish to avoid such a strong assumption on $\mathbf{G}$, we present a slightly different definition in §5, which coincides with Yu's definition when $\mathbf{G}$ is tame. We examine commutators of these subgroups (see, for example, Lemma 5.32) and show that they support an analogue of the Moy–Prasad map (see Lemma 5.22). In §5.3, we explore further the descent properties of these subgroups under mild tameness hypotheses on $\mathbf{G}$. Of particular note in this subsection is Proposition 5.40, which gives a very concrete picture of our filtration subgroups in many cases.

Now we turn to analyzing the analogue in G of the product decomposition ($*$). If $\gamma \in D$ and $\operatorname{ord}_D(\gamma) = 0$, then the first term, $\varepsilon_0 \varpi_D^{\operatorname{ord}_D(\gamma)} = \varepsilon_0$, in the product decomposition is well defined (i.e., independent of the choice of ϖ_D). The analogue in general of this decomposition of $\gamma \in D$ into the "first term" and the "remaining terms" of ($*$) is the notion of a topological Jordan decomposition of a compact element, which was introduced in [20, §3], and Lemma 2 of [21, §3]. In a separate paper, one of us (L. S.) defines the analogous notion of a topological Jordan decomposition of an element of a topological group modulo a subgroup (see Definition 2.23 of [43]), and discusses when such a decomposition exists (see Proposition 2.36 of loc. cit.).

In §6, we begin to discuss the full product decomposition for an element of G. In fact, for our purposes, it is most useful not to consider the entire infinite product at once, but rather just finite approximations. Thus we introduce the idea of a *(normal) r-approximation* (see Definition 6.8), which will underlie the remainder of the article. We define some useful notation (see Definitions 6.4 and 6.6) and observe a few basic but fundamental facts (see Remarks 6.7 and 6.10).

Before proving our main results about normal approximations, we need to have a detailed understanding of the properties of *good elements* (see Definition 6.1). In §7, we study the effect of taking commutators with such elements. We omit a detailed description of the results of this section, since most of them are very technical and intended only for use in the next section. The Lie algebra analogues of most of these results are already known (see [1, §2] and [22, §2]).

In §8, we are in a position to answer questions about the existence and uniqueness of normal approximations. Under mild hypotheses on $\mathbf{G}$, all tame and bounded modulo center elements of G admit normal approximations (see Lemma 8.1). Although normal approximations are by no means unique, they are "unique enough", in a precise sense. In particular, the centralizer of a truncation of an element is uniquely determined (see Proposition 8.4). Finally, in §9, we address the question of how to recognize when an element is close to a tame Levi subgroup. This will be important for our forthcoming character computations (see [5]). Lemma 9.10 describes the elements which conjugate something close to a tame Levi subgroup, into something close to the tame Levi subgroup. Proposition 9.14 characterizes the elements which are close to a tame Levi subgroup that is F-anisotropic modulo its center.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS: This paper was motivated in large part by the notes of the late Lawrence Corwin on his computation of characters of division algebras and has benefited from our conversations with Paul Sally, Gopal Prasad, Stephen DeBacker, Brian Conrad, and Jiu-Kang Yu. It is a pleasure to thank all of these people.

2. SOME ASSUMPTIONS

Suppose F is a discretely valued field as in §3.2, F^{tr} is the maximal tamely ramified extension of F in a fixed algebraic closure, and $\mathbf{G}$ is a connected reductive F-group.

For easy reference, we collect here all the hypotheses on F and $\mathbf{G}$ which we will need throughout this document. Many of our results remain valid if we only assume some subset of these hypotheses. See Remark 2.1 for a more detailed discussion. Although the hypotheses include some terms which have not yet been defined, every term in each hypothesis will be defined before that hypothesis is used.

Hypotheses.

(A) *The relative root system* ${}_{F^{\mathrm{tr}}}\Phi(\mathbf{G})$ *is reduced.*

(B) *If* E/F *is a discretely valued, separable extension and* $\gamma \in \mathbf{G}(E)_{0+}$ *is semisimple, then* $C_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma)^\circ$ *is a Levi subgroup of* $\mathbf{G}$*.*

(C) *There is a connected reductive* F*-group* $\mathbf{J}$ *such that*
  - *the absolute ranks of* $\mathbf{G}$ *and* $\mathbf{J}$ *are the same,*
  - $\mathbf{G}$ *is a compatibly filtered* F*-subgroup of* $\mathbf{J}$ *(in the sense of Definition 4.3), and*
  - *for some (hence every) maximal torus* $\mathbf{T}'$ *in the derived group* $\mathbf{J}_{\mathrm{ss}}$*, the order of* $P(\mathbf{J}_{\mathrm{ss}}, \mathbf{T}')/\mathbf{X}^*(\mathbf{T}')$ *is not divisible by* $\operatorname{char} \mathfrak{f}$*.*

(D) *For any tower of discretely valued separable extensions* $E/L/F$ *with* E/L *Galois and unramified, and any maximal* L*-torus* $\mathbf{T}$ *in* $\mathbf{G}$ *with the same* L^{tr}*-split rank as* $\mathbf{G}$*, we have* $H^1(E/L, \mathbf{T}(E)_{c:c+}) = \{0\}$ *for* $c \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$*.*

Remark 2.1. Hypothesis (A) applies in all of §5.3, and therefore is needed in the part of the document which relies on that section, namely, everything from Lemma 7.2 onward. Hypothesis (B) is used only in the proof of Lemma 7.6. Hypothesis (C) is used only in the proof of Lemma 7.1. Hypothesis (D) is used in the proof of Corollary 5.38, and therefore again is needed in the part of the document which relies on §5.3.

Remark 2.2. There are several situations in which these hypotheses are known to hold. In particular, we will see below that they all hold if $\operatorname{char} \mathfrak{f} = 0$.

Hypothesis (A) is satisfied if and only if, for some finite tame Galois extension L/F, ${}_L\Phi(\mathbf{G})$ is reduced. By [44, §17], Hypothesis (A) is satisfied if the (absolute) root system of $\mathbf{G}$ contains no irreducible factor of type A_{2n}. Hypothesis (A) obviously holds when $\mathbf{G}/Z(\mathbf{G})^\circ$ (which we will later denote by $\widetilde{\mathbf{G}}$) contains an F^{tr}-split maximal F-torus; in particular, when $\operatorname{char} \mathfrak{f} = 0$. Lemma A.15 shows that Hypothesis (A) holds when $\operatorname{char} \mathfrak{f} \neq 2$.

Any finite-order root value of a semisimple element of $\mathbf{G}(E)_{0+}$ (where E/F is a discretely valued, separable extension) has p-power order, where $p := \operatorname{char} \mathfrak{f}$. (The term "root value" is defined in Definition A.4.) Thus Proposition A.7 shows that Hypothesis (B) is satisfied if p is not a bad prime for $\mathbf{G}$ (in the sense of Definition A.5); in particular, if $p = 0$.

Each of the following conditions implies Hypothesis (C):

- $\operatorname{char} \mathfrak{f} = 0$;
- $\mathbf{G}$ has simply connected derived group;

- $\operatorname{char} \mathfrak{f} > 3$, and $\mathbf{G}$ contains no factor of type A_n with n divisible by $\operatorname{char} \mathfrak{f}$.

By Proposition 5.5 of [49], Hypothesis (D) is satisfied if all the relevant tori satisfy condition (**T**) of [49, §4.7.1]. This is true, in turn, if $\mathbf{G}$ is tame; in particular, if $\operatorname{char} \mathfrak{f} = 0$. By Proposition 4.4.16 of [13], it is also true if $\mathbf{G}$ is adjoint or simply connected.

Remark 2.3. Clearly, Hypothesis (A) is inherited by full-tame-rank closed reductive subgroups of $\mathbf{G}$; Hypothesis (C) is inherited by full-rank compatibly filtered F-subgroups of $\mathbf{G}$; and Hypothesis (D) is inherited by full-rank, full-tame-rank F-subgroups of $\mathbf{G}$.

Hypothesis (B) is inherited by connected full-rank compatibly filtered F-subgroups of $\mathbf{G}$. To see this, suppose Hypothesis (B) holds for $\mathbf{G}$, let $\mathbf{H}$ be such a subgroup, and suppose $\gamma \in \mathbf{H}(E)_{0+}$ is semisimple for some separable extension E/F. Then $\gamma \in \mathbf{G}(E)_{0+}$, so $\mathbf{M} := C_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma)^\circ$ is a Levi subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$; that is, $\mathbf{M} = C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S})$, where $\mathbf{S} = Z(\mathbf{M})^\circ$. By hypothesis, there is a maximal F-torus $\mathbf{T} \subseteq \mathbf{H}$ such that $\gamma \in T$. Then $\mathbf{T}$ is a maximal torus in $\mathbf{M}$, so $\mathbf{S} \subseteq \mathbf{T} \subseteq \mathbf{H}$. Thus $\mathbf{M} \cap \mathbf{H} = C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S}) \cap \mathbf{H} = C_{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{S})$ is a Levi subgroup of $\mathbf{H}$. Clearly $C_{\mathbf{H}}(\gamma)^\circ \subseteq \mathbf{M} \cap \mathbf{H} \subseteq C_{\mathbf{H}}(\gamma)$. Since $\mathbf{M} \cap \mathbf{H}$ is connected, we have $\mathbf{M} \cap \mathbf{H} = C_{\mathbf{H}}(\gamma)^\circ$. That is, Hypothesis (B) also holds for $\mathbf{H}$.

Further, all hypotheses are preserved under base change (to a discretely valued separable extension of F). As a consequence, whenever we have proved a result for the group $G = \mathbf{G}(F)$, we will feel free to use it also for a group $\mathbf{H}(E)$, where $\mathbf{H}$ is a full-rank, full-tame-rank reductive (necessarily closed and compatibly filtered) F-subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$ and E/F is a discretely valued separable extension.

3. PRELIMINARIES

3.1. **Generalities on linear reductive groups.** For an abstract group G, let $Z(G)$ denote the center of G. For a field F and a linear algebraic F-group $\mathbf{G}$, let $Z(\mathbf{G})$ denote the center of $\mathbf{G}$. (By this, we do not mean the scheme-theoretic center of $\mathbf{G}$, but rather the underlying reduced scheme. Note that, for example, if $\operatorname{char} F = p$ and $\mathbf{G} = \mathrm{SL}_p$, then $Z(\mathbf{G})$ is the trivial variety, not the scheme μ_p whose ring of regular functions is $F[X]/(X^p - 1)$. This makes a difference in Remark 4.1.) By Theorem 18.2(ii) of [7], if $\mathbf{G}$ is connected and reductive, then $Z(\mathbf{G})$ is defined over F and $Z(\mathbf{G})(F) = Z(\mathbf{G}(F))$. Denote by $\mathbf{G}^\circ$ the identity component of $\mathbf{G}$, and by $\widetilde{\mathbf{G}}$ the quotient $\mathbf{G}/Z(\mathbf{G})^\circ$. If $\mathbf{G}$ is connected and reductive, then, by Proposition 22.4 of [7], the natural F-homomorphism $\mathbf{G} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathbf{G}}$ is central (in the sense of [7, §22.3]). The image of $g \in \mathbf{G}(\overline{F})$ under this map will be denoted by $\overline{g}$.

We will use bold letters to denote algebraic groups, and the corresponding normal letters to denote their groups of F-rational points. Thus, for example, $G = \mathbf{G}(F)$. Note, however, that $\widetilde{G} = \widetilde{\mathbf{G}}(F)$ need not equal $G/Z(G)^\circ$. For convenience, we will often define notation such as, say, $G_{x,r}$ (see §3.4), and omit the analogous definition of the notation $\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,r}$, for E/F a discretely valued algebraic extension.

For $g, h \in \mathbf{G}(\overline{F})$, let $\operatorname{Int}(g)$ denote the inner automorphism of $\mathbf{G}$ given by $x \mapsto gxg^{-1}$; $[g, h]$ denote $ghg^{-1}h^{-1}$; and $C_{\mathbf{G}}(g)$ denote the centralizer of g in $\mathbf{G}$. We will write ${}^g h = \operatorname{Int}(g)h$ and $h^g = \operatorname{Int}(g^{-1})h$. For subsets $S, S' \subseteq \mathbf{G}(\overline{F})$, we define ${}^S h$, ${}^h S'$, ${}^S S'$, etc., in the obvious way. (Use similar notations for an abstract group G.) Put $\operatorname{Ad}(g) = d(\operatorname{Int}(g))$ and $\operatorname{Ad}^*(g) = \operatorname{Ad}(g)^*$. If $X \in \operatorname{Lie}(\mathbf{G})(\overline{F})$ and $X^* \in \operatorname{Lie}(\mathbf{G})^*(\overline{F})$, we will write

$$\begin{aligned} {}^g X &= \operatorname{Ad}(g)X, & X^g &= \operatorname{Ad}(g^{-1})X, \\ {}^g X^* &= \operatorname{Ad}^*(g)X^*, & (X^*)^g &= \operatorname{Ad}^*(g^{-1})X. \end{aligned}$$

For a subset $S' \subseteq \operatorname{Lie}(\mathbf{G})(\overline{F})$ or $S' \subseteq \operatorname{Lie}(\mathbf{G})^*(\overline{F})$, define ${}^g S'$, etc., as above.

Let $\mathbf{X}^*(\mathbf{G}) = \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathrm{alg}}(\mathbf{G}, \mathrm{GL}_1)$ and $\mathbf{X}_*(\mathbf{G}) = \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathrm{alg}}(\mathrm{GL}_1, \mathbf{G})$. For any extension E/F, denote by $\mathbf{X}^*_E(\mathbf{G})$ the set of $\chi \in \mathbf{X}^*(\mathbf{G})$ defined over E, and similarly for $\mathbf{X}_*^E(\mathbf{G})$.

If $g \in \mathbf{G}(\overline{F})$, then let g_{ss} and g_{un} denote the semisimple and unipotent parts, respectively, of the Jordan decomposition of g. Note that, if g is F-rational, then g_{ss} and g_{un} are defined over some finite, totally inseparable extension of F.

If a torus $\mathbf{S}$ acts on $\mathbf{G}$, we denote by $\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S})$ and by $\Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S})$ the collections of weights and of non-zero weights for the corresponding action on $\operatorname{Lie}(\mathbf{G})$.

From now on, $\mathbf{G}$ is a linear reductive F-group. If $\mathbf{S}$ is a maximal F-split torus in $\mathbf{G}$, then $\Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S})$ is a root system in $\mathbf{X}^*(\mathbf{S}') \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}$ by Theorem 21.6 of [7]. (Here, $\mathbf{S}'$ is the identity component of the intersection of $\mathbf{S}$ with the derived group of $\mathbf{G}$.) We will sometimes write ${}_F\Phi(\mathbf{G})$ instead of $\Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S})$ if we only care about the isomorphism type of the root system. We will call the elements of ${}_F\Phi(\mathbf{G})$ *F-roots*. If $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{S}'$ (for example, if $\mathbf{G}$ is semisimple), then we define the *weight lattice* $P(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S})$ to be the space of those $\chi \in \mathbf{X}^*(\mathbf{S}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}$ such that $\langle \chi, \alpha^\vee \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all $\alpha^\vee \in \Phi^\vee(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S})$, where $\Phi^\vee(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S})$ is the coroot system dual to $\Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S})$ and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the natural pairing of $\mathbf{X}^*(\mathbf{S}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}$ with $\mathbf{X}_*(\mathbf{S}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}$.

By Grothendieck's theorem (see Theorem 18.2(i) of [7]), a torus in $\mathbf{G}$ is a maximal F-torus if and only if it is a maximal torus which is defined over F. We will often use this fact without further remark.

Put $\widetilde{\mathbb{R}} := \mathbb{R} \sqcup \{r+ \mid r \in \mathbb{R}\} \sqcup \{\infty\}$, and extend the ordering on $\mathbb{R}$ to one on $\widetilde{\mathbb{R}}$ as follows: for all $r, s \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{array}{rll} r < s+ & \text{if and only if} & r \le s; \\ r+ < s+ & \text{if and only if} & r < s; \\ r+ < s & \text{if and only if} & r < s; \end{array}$$

and $r, r+ < \infty$. For $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, define $(r+)+ := r+$ and $\lambda(r+) := (\lambda r)+$. Define also $\lambda\infty := \infty$ and $\infty+ := \infty$. Extend the additive structure on $\mathbb{R}$ to an additive structure on $\widetilde{\mathbb{R}}$ in the natural way. Let $\widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{>0} := \{r \in \widetilde{\mathbb{R}} \mid r > 0\}$ and $\widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{\ge 0} := \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{>0} \cup \{0\}$, and define $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $\mathbb{R}_{\ge 0}$ similarly.

3.2. **Buildings and affine root groups.** Assume from now on that F has a non-trivial discrete valuation ord, and that there is a subfield of F, over which F is algebraic, which is complete and has perfect residue field. For any algebraic extension E/F, denote again by ord the unique extension of ord to a valuation on E. If this extended valuation ord remains discrete, we will say that E/F is a discretely valued algebraic extension. Note that this happens precisely when E/F has finite ramification degree. Fix an algebraic closure $\overline{F}$ of F. Let F^{un}/F, F^{tr}/F and F^{sep}/F be the maximal unramified, tame, and separable subextensions of $\overline{F}/F$, respectively. For $r \in \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}$, put $F_r = \{t \in F \mid \operatorname{ord}(t) \ge r\}$. Put $\mathfrak{f}_F = F_0/F_{0+}$, the residue field of F. When F is understood, we will often just write $\mathfrak{f}$. Put also $F_0^\times = \{t \in F \mid \operatorname{ord}(t) = 0\}$ and (if $r > 0$) $F_r^\times = 1 + F_r$.

By Proposition 16.4.9 of [44], some twist of $\mathbf{G}$ by an element of the cohomology set $H^1(F^{\mathrm{sep}}/F^{\mathrm{un}}, \mathbf{G}_{\mathrm{ad}}(F^{\mathrm{sep}}))$ is F^{un}-quasisplit, where $\mathbf{G}_{\mathrm{ad}}$ is the adjoint group of $\mathbf{G}$. By Theorem 12 of [26], F^{un} is C_1 (as in the second definition of [26, p. 374]). By Corollary II.3.2 of [39], $\dim(F^{\mathrm{un}}) \le 1$, so, by [8, §8.6], $H^1(F^{\mathrm{sep}}/F^{\mathrm{un}}, \mathbf{G}_{\mathrm{ad}}(F^{\mathrm{sep}})) = \{0\}$. Thus $\mathbf{G}$ is F^{un}-quasisplit. We will use this fact frequently without mention.

Let $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F)$ denote the (enlarged) Bruhat–Tits building, and $\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{red}}(\mathbf{G}, F)$ the reduced building, of $\mathbf{G}$ over F. Note that $\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{red}}(\mathbf{G}, F)$ and $\mathcal{B}(\widetilde{\mathbf{G}}, F)$ are canonically isomorphic, and

$$\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F) = \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{red}}(\mathbf{G}, F) \times V_F(Z(\mathbf{G}))$$

(where $V_F(Z(\mathbf{G}))$ is an affine space under $\mathbf{X}_*^F(\mathbf{G}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R} = \mathbf{X}_*^F(Z(\mathbf{G})) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$). Denote by pr or pr_F the natural projection $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{red}}(\mathbf{G}, F)$, and by $\overline{x}$ the image of a typical element $x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F)$ under pr_F. If E/F is a discretely valued algebraic extension, then there are canonical embeddings $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, E)$ and $\mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{red}}(\mathbf{G}, F) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{red}}(\mathbf{G}, E)$, and we have that

$\mathrm{pr}_E\big|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G},F)} = \mathrm{pr}_F$. If E/F is Galois, then $\mathrm{Gal}(E/F)$ acts on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G},E)$, and we have that $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G},F) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G},E)^{\mathrm{Gal}(E/F)}$, with equality when E/F is tamely ramified (see Proposition 5.1.1 of [35]).

Suppose that $\mathbf{S}$ is a maximal F-split torus in $\mathbf{G}$ (but not necessarily a maximal torus). For $a \in \Phi(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{S})$, Proposition 21.9(i) of [7] shows that there is a unique connected F-subgroup $\mathbf{U}_a \subseteq \mathbf{G}$, normalized by $C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S})$, such that $\mathrm{Lie}(\mathbf{U}_a)$ is the direct sum of the root subspaces of $\mathrm{Lie}(\mathbf{G})$ corresponding to positive integer multiples of a. If $a = 0$, then put $\mathbf{U}_a = C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S})$. If $a \notin \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{S})$, then put $\mathbf{U}_a = \{1\}$.

We will denote by $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$ the "empty" apartment associated to $\mathbf{S}$ over F. (As in [25], we use the word "empty" to indicate that there is no polysimplicial structure. However, for convenience, we *will* regard it as equipped with its natural metric as an affine Euclidean space.) If we regard $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$ as a subset of $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G},F)$, and wish to emphasize its polysimplicial structure, we will write ${}_{\mathbf{G}}\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$ instead. Recall that the space $\mathbf{X}_*(\mathbf{S}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$ acts transitively on $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$, giving the latter the structure of an affine space. The gradient $\dot{\varphi}$ of an affine function φ on $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$ is thus a linear function on $\mathbf{X}_*(\mathbf{S}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$. In particular, via the natural pairing $\mathbf{X}^*(\mathbf{S}) \times \mathbf{X}_*(\mathbf{S}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}$, we may identify $\dot{\varphi}$ with an element of $\mathbf{X}^*(\mathbf{S}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$.

For any affine function φ on $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$, define $\varphi+$ to be the function on $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$ given by $(\varphi+)(x) = (\varphi(x))+$ for $x \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$, and put $(\varphi+)^{\cdot} := \dot{\varphi}$. We will also refer to $\varphi+$ as an affine function. For every root $a \in \Phi(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{S})$, there are filtrations $(U_\varphi)_\varphi$ and $(\mathfrak{u}_\varphi)_\varphi$ of the corresponding root group U_a and root space $\mathrm{Lie}(U_a)$, respectively, both indexed by affine functions φ on $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$ such that $\dot{\varphi} = a$. (The indexing of the filtration depends on our choice of valuation ord.) If necessary, we will write ${}_F U_\varphi$ instead of just U_φ to indicate the dependence on the field F. We will not define these objects here (but see §3.3 and the proof of Proposition 4.6).

Denote by $\Psi(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{S})$ the set consisting of the affine functions φ on $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$ such that $\dot{\varphi} \in \Phi(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{S})$, together with the constant function $\varphi = \infty$ on $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$. Denote by $\widetilde{\Psi}(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{S})$ the union of $\Psi(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{S})$ with the collection of $\widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{\geq 0}$-valued constant functions on $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$. The elements of $\widetilde{\Psi}(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{S})$ will be called *affine roots* (or *affine F-roots*). Note that this is contrary to the usual usage, which calls an element $\varphi \in \widetilde{\Psi}(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{S})$ an affine root only if $U_\varphi \neq U_{\varphi+}$ (or $U_\varphi \neq U_{\varphi+} \cdot U_{2\varphi}$, if $\dot{\varphi}$ is multipliable).

Suppose that E/F is a discretely valued algebraic extension such that $\mathbf{G}$ contains a maximal E-split torus $\mathbf{S}^\sharp$ defined over F. For any affine E-root ψ, ${}^\sigma({}_E U_\psi) = {}_E U_{\psi\circ\sigma}$ for $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(E/F)$; and, if $\mathbf{S}^\sharp = \mathbf{S}$, then ${}_F U_\psi = {}_E U_\psi \cap U_{\dot{\psi}}$.

A proof of the following lemma appears in the proof of Proposition 1.4.1 of [1].

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose that* $\mathbf{G}$ *is* F*-quasisplit and* $\mathbf{S}$ *is a maximal* F*-split torus in* $\mathbf{G}$*. For any affine function* φ *on* $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$*,* ${}_F U_\varphi = \bigl(\prod {}_E U_\psi\bigr) \cap \mathbf{U}_{\dot\varphi}(F)$*, where* E *is the splitting field of* $C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S})$ *and the product runs over all affine* E*-roots* ψ *whose restriction to* $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$ *is* φ*.*

Because of the following lemma, the fact that our field F need not be complete does not cause any serious difficulties. The statement is lengthy only so that the result can cover all necessary applications; the proof itself is quite easy.

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose that*

- M' *is a subfield of* F *such that*
  - F/M' *is algebraic,*
  - M' *is complete with respect to the restriction of* ord*, and*
  - $\mathfrak{f}_{M'}$ *is perfect;*

  and
- $\mathbf{G}^1, \dots, \mathbf{G}^n$ *are finitely many* F*-groups (not necessarily connected or reductive).*

Suppose that we are given also, for each $1 \le i \le n$*,*

- *a finite subset* $\mathcal{S}^i$ *of* G^i*;*
- *an* F*-split torus* $\mathbf{T}^i$ *in* $\mathbf{G}^i$*; and*
- *a finite subset* $\mathcal{F}^i$ *of* $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}^i, F)$ *(whenever the building makes sense).*

Then there is a finite subextension F'/M' *of* F/M' *such that* F' *is complete with respect to* ord*,* F/F' *is unramified, and, for each* $1 \le i \le n$*,*

- $\mathbf{G}^i$ *and* $\mathbf{T}^i$ *are defined over* F'*,*
- $\mathcal{S}^i \subseteq \mathbf{G}^i(F')$*;*
- $\mathcal{F}^i \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}^i, F')$ *(whenever the building makes sense); and*
- $\mathbf{T}^i$ *splits over* F'*.*

Proof. Let ϖ be a uniformizer for F and put $M = M'[\varpi]$. Then the value groups of M and F are the same. Since the residue field of M', hence also of M, is perfect, $\mathfrak{f}_F/\mathfrak{f}_M$ is separable. Thus F/M is unramified (in particular, separable).

We may, and hence do, assume that each $\mathbf{T}^i$ is some $\mathbf{G}^j$. Since each $\mathbf{G}^i$ is an affine F-variety, there exist integers m and r and polynomials $f_{11}(\vec{x}), \dots, f_{nr}(\vec{x}) \in F[x_1, \dots, x_m]$ such that the ring of regular functions on $\mathbf{G}^i$ is of the form

$$\overline{F}[x_1, \dots, x_m]/\langle f_{ij}(\vec{x}) : j = 1, \dots, r\rangle$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Denote by $\mathcal{X}^i$ an integral basis of $\mathbf{X}_*(\mathbf{T}^i) = \mathbf{X}_*^F(\mathbf{T}^i)$. Now let N be the fixed field in $M^{\mathrm{sep}} = F^{\mathrm{sep}}$ of the stabilizer in $\operatorname{Gal}(M^{\mathrm{sep}}/M)$ of $\bigl\{ f_{ij}(\vec{x}) \bigm| i = 1, \dots, n; j = 1, \dots r\bigr\}$, and F' the fixed field in $N^{\mathrm{sep}} = F^{\mathrm{sep}}$ of the common stabilizer in $\operatorname{Gal}(N^{\mathrm{sep}}/N)$ of the various $\mathcal{X}^i$, $\mathcal{F}^i$, and

$\mathcal{S}^i$. Since all of the sets in question are finite, the relevant stabilizers are open, so N/M and F'/N, hence F'/M, are finite. Since M/M' is finite, so is F'/M'. Further, since $\operatorname{Gal}(F^{\mathrm{sep}}/F)$ fixes the various $\mathcal{X}^i$, $\mathcal{F}^i$, $\mathcal{S}^i$, and $f_{ij}(\vec{x})$, we have that $F' \subseteq F$. □

3.3. **Les épinglages.** In this subsection only, let $\mathbf{T}$ be a maximal F-torus in $\mathbf{G}$, and E/F a discretely valued Galois extension over which $\mathbf{T}$ splits. For each $\alpha \in \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$, denote by F_α the fixed field in E of $\operatorname{stab}_{\operatorname{Gal}(E/F)} \alpha$. By Theorem 18.7 of [7], there is an F_α^{sep}-isomorphism (in fact, an E-isomorphism) $\operatorname{Add} \longrightarrow \mathbf{U}_\alpha$ such that, for any $t \in \mathbf{T}(\overline{F})$, the pullback of the conjugation action of t on $\mathbf{U}_\alpha$ is scalar multiplication by $\alpha(t)$ on Add. Since Add, $\mathbf{T}$, and $\mathbf{U}_\alpha$ are defined over F_α, the set of such isomorphisms is a GL_1-torsor over F_α. Since $H^1(F_\alpha^{\mathrm{sep}}/F_\alpha, \mathrm{GL}_1(F_\alpha^{\mathrm{sep}})) = \{0\}$, the torsor has a $\operatorname{Gal}(F_\alpha^{\mathrm{sep}}/F_\alpha)$-fixed point. Choose such a point, i.e., isomorphism, and call it e_α. Since $\sigma \circ \mathsf{e}_\alpha \circ \sigma^{-1} = \mathsf{e}_\alpha$ for $\alpha \in \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$ and $\sigma \in \operatorname{stab}_{\operatorname{Gal}(E/F)} \alpha$, we may, and hence do, make our choices in such a way that $\sigma \circ \mathsf{e}_\alpha \circ \sigma^{-1} = \mathsf{e}_{\sigma\alpha}$ for $\alpha \in \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$ and $\sigma \in \operatorname{Gal}(E/F)$.

Now suppose that L/F is a Galois subextension of E/F such that

- $\mathbf{G}$ is L-quasisplit,
- $\mathbf{T}$ contains a maximal L-split torus $\mathbf{S}^\sharp$ in $\mathbf{G}$ which is defined over F, and
- $\Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S}^\sharp)$ is reduced.

Define fields L_α for $\alpha \in \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$ by analogy with the fields F_α above, and let $\mathcal{O}_L$ and $\mathcal{O}_{L_\alpha}$ be the rings of integers of L and L_α, respectively. As in [13, §4.1.5], the E-épinglage $(\mathsf{e}_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})}$ of $\mathbf{G} \otimes_F E$ gives rise to an L-épinglage $(\mathsf{e}_a)_{a \in \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S}^\sharp)}$ of $\mathbf{G} \otimes_F L$, from which in turn we deduce, as in [13, §4.3], for each affine L-root φ an $\mathcal{O}_L$-scheme $\mathfrak{U}_\varphi$ such that

- the generic fiber of $\mathfrak{U}_\varphi$ is $\mathbf{U}_{\dot\varphi}$;
- if $\alpha \in \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$ restricts to $\dot\varphi$, then there is an $\mathcal{O}_L$-isomorphism $R_{\mathcal{O}_{L_\alpha}/\mathcal{O}_L} \operatorname{Add} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{U}_\varphi$ which induces the map $\mathsf{e}_{\dot\varphi}$ on generic fibers; and
- $\mathfrak{U}_\varphi(\mathcal{O}_L) = U_\varphi$.

Moreover, if $\varphi_1 \geq \varphi_2$ and $\dot\varphi_1 = \dot\varphi_2$, then there is an inclusion $\mathfrak{U}_{\varphi_1} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{U}_{\varphi_2}$ which induces an isomorphism on generic fibers.

Fix an element $a \in \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S}^\sharp)$. For any affine L-root φ with $\dot\varphi = a$, $\operatorname{Lie}(\mathbf{U}_{\dot\varphi})$ is the generic fiber of $\operatorname{Lie}(\mathfrak{U}_\varphi)$. By [49, §8.7], $\mathfrak{u}_\varphi = \operatorname{Lie}(\mathfrak{U}_\varphi)(\mathcal{O}_L)$. Thus the natural $\mathcal{O}_L$-isomorphism $\operatorname{Add} \cong \operatorname{Lie}(\operatorname{Add})$ furnishes an isomorphism $\mathsf{e}_\varphi : \mathfrak{u}_\varphi \longrightarrow U_\varphi$. These maps are compatible, in the sense that, if $\varphi_1 \geq \varphi_2$ and $\dot\varphi_j = a$ for $j = 1, 2$, then $\mathsf{e}_{\varphi_2}\big|_{\mathfrak{u}_{\varphi_1}} = \mathsf{e}_{\varphi_1}$. Thus they may be pieced together to form an isomorphism $\operatorname{Lie}(\mathbf{U}_a)(L) \longrightarrow \mathbf{U}_a(L)$, which (by abuse of notation) we will denote by e_a. By following the details of the construction, one verifies easily that $\sigma \circ \mathsf{e}_a \circ \sigma^{-1} = \mathsf{e}_{\sigma a}$ for $\sigma \in \operatorname{Gal}(L/F)$.

3.4. **Filtrations and depth.** The group G acts on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F)$ by isometries. We call a subgroup K of G *bounded* if its image in the isometry group of $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F)$ is bounded in the sense of Exemple 3.1.2(b) of [12], i.e., if and only if the orbit under K of any bounded subset of $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F)$ remains bounded. Clearly, $\operatorname{stab}_G(x)$ is bounded for any $x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F)$. Conversely, suppose that K is a bounded subgroup of G, and fix $\overline{y} \in \mathcal{B}^{\text{red}}(\mathbf{G}, F)$ (arbitrarily). By Proposition 3.2.4 of loc. cit., K fixes a point $\overline{x}$ in the closure of the convex hull of $K \cdot \overline{y}$, hence acts by translations on any lift $x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F)$ of $\overline{x}$. Since the orbit of x under K is bounded, we have that $K \subseteq \operatorname{stab}_G(x)$. If $\mathbf{N}$ is a closed normal subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$, then we call a subgroup K of G *bounded modulo* $\mathbf{N}$ if its image in $(\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{N})(F)$ is bounded. Then a subgroup of G is bounded modulo center if it fixes a point in $\mathcal{B}^{\text{red}}(\mathbf{G}, F)$. Call an element of G *bounded* (respectively, *bounded modulo* $\mathbf{N}$) if it belongs to a subgroup of G that is bounded (respectively, bounded modulo $\mathbf{N}$). When F is locally compact (equivalently, $\mathfrak{f}$ is finite), a subgroup is bounded if and only if it is pre-compact. When F is an algebraic extension of a locally compact field, an element is bounded if and only if it belongs to a compact subgroup. For every point $x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F)$, the stabilizer $\operatorname{stab}_G(x)$ is open and (as we have observed) bounded, and contains a normal and finite-index subgroup G_x, the *parahoric subgroup* associated to x, which depends only on the image $\overline{x}$ of x in $\mathcal{B}^{\text{red}}(\mathbf{G}, F)$. (See Définition 5.2.6 of [13].)

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose that*

- $\mathbf{G}$ *is* F*-quasisplit,*
- $x, y \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$*, and*
- $g \in G$ *satisfies* $g \cdot x = y$*.*

Then $g \in N_G(S) \cdot G_x$*.*

Proof. We have that $x \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S}) \cap \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S}^g)$. By Proposition 4.6.28(iii) of [13], there is $h \in G_x$ such that $\mathbf{S}^{gh} = \mathbf{S}$. That is, $gh \in N_G(S)$, so $g \in N_G(S) \cdot G_x$. □

The set T of F-rational points of an F-torus $\mathbf{T}$ comes equipped with a natural filtration. First, note that T has a unique maximal bounded subgroup T_{b}, and a unique parahoric subgroup T_0. These two groups are equal if $\mathbf{T}$ is F-split, or, more generally, if, over some unramified extension of F, $\mathbf{T}$ is a product of induced tori; but, in general, we can only say that T_0 is a finite-index subgroup of T_{b}. For $r \in \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{\geq 0}$, we put

$$T_r = \bigl\{ t \in T_0 \bigm| \operatorname{ord}(\chi(t) - 1) \geq r \text{ for all } \chi \in \mathbf{X}^*(\mathbf{T}) \bigr\}.$$

The filtration $(\operatorname{Lie}(T)_r)_{r\in\widetilde{\mathbb{R}}}$ on $\operatorname{Lie}(T)$ is defined similarly (except that we do not have to worry about passing to finite-index subgroups).

For $(x,r)\in\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G},F)\times\widetilde{\mathbb{R}}$ with $r<\infty$, Moy and Prasad (see [28] and [29]) define a lattice $\operatorname{Lie}(G)_{x,r}$ in $\operatorname{Lie}(G)$ and, if $r\geq 0$, a bounded open subgroup $G_{x,r}$ of G as follows. By Corollaire 5.1.12 of [13], there exists a maximal F^{un}-split torus which is defined over F. Fix such a torus $\mathbf{S}^\sharp$. Since $\mathbf{G}$ is F^{un}-quasisplit, $\mathbf{T}:=C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S}^\sharp)$ is a maximal torus in $\mathbf{G}$. Put

$$\mathbf{G}(F^{\mathrm{un}})_{x,r}=\langle\mathbf{T}(F^{\mathrm{un}})_r,U_\psi:\psi\in\Psi(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{S}^\sharp),\psi(x)\geq r\rangle\quad\text{if } r\geq 0$$

and

$$\operatorname{Lie}(\mathbf{G})(F^{\mathrm{un}})_{x,r}=\operatorname{Lie}(\mathbf{T})(F^{\mathrm{un}})_r\oplus\sum_{\substack{\psi\in\Psi(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{S}^\sharp)\\ \psi(x)\geq r}}\mathfrak{u}_\psi\,.$$

(In both cases, we may restrict the indexing set to those $\psi\in\Psi(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{S}^\sharp)$ for which $\psi(x)=r$.) These groups and lattices are $\operatorname{Gal}(F^{\mathrm{un}}/F)$-stable. Put

$$G_{x,r}=\mathbf{G}(F^{\mathrm{un}})_{x,r}\cap G\quad\text{and}\quad\operatorname{Lie}(G)_{x,r}=\operatorname{Lie}(\mathbf{G})(F^{\mathrm{un}})_{x,r}\cap\operatorname{Lie}(G).$$

We have that $G_{x,0}=G_x$. These definitions extend in an obvious fashion to the case $r=\infty$, giving $G_{x,r}=\{1\}$ and $\operatorname{Lie}(G)_{x,r}=\{0\}$.

Remark 3.4. By Proposition 6.4.48 of [12] and Lemma 3.2, the multiplication map

$$\mathbf{T}(F^{\mathrm{un}})_r\times\prod_{\substack{\psi\in\Psi(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{S}^\sharp)\\ \psi(x)=r}}{}_{F^{\mathrm{un}}}U_\psi\longrightarrow\mathbf{G}(F^{\mathrm{un}})_{x,r}$$

(the product taken in any order) is a bijection when $r>0$.

For a fixed $x\in\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G},F)$, $(\operatorname{Lie}(G)_{x,r})_{\substack{r\in\widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{\geq 0}\\ r<\infty}}$ and $(G_{x,r})_{\substack{r\in\widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{\geq 0}\\ r<\infty}}$ are filtrations of $\operatorname{Lie}(G)_{x,0}$ and $G_{x,0}$ by normal lattices and open normal subgroups, respectively. (The indexings of these filtrations depend on our choice of valuation ord.) Put $G_r=\bigcup_{x\in\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G},F)}G_{x,r}$ and $\operatorname{Lie}(G)_r=\bigcup_{x\in\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G},F)}\operatorname{Lie}(G)_{x,r}$ for $r\in\widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{\geq 0}$ or $r\in\widetilde{\mathbb{R}}$, as appropriate, with $r<\infty$. Put $G_\infty=\bigcap_{\substack{r\in\widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{\geq 0}\\ r<\infty}}G_r$ and $\operatorname{Lie}(G)_\infty=\bigcap_{\substack{r\in\widetilde{\mathbb{R}}\\ r<\infty}}\operatorname{Lie}(G)_r$. (These sets are related to the sets of unipotent elements in G and nilpotent elements in $\operatorname{Lie}(G)$, respectively. See [3, §§2.5, 3.7.1].)

For $x\in\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G},F)$, there are $(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\cup\{\infty\})$-valued functions d_x on $G_{x,0}$ and d on G_0, given by $\mathrm{d}_x(g)=\max\left\{r\in\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\cup\{\infty\}\bigm| g\in G_{x,r}\right\}$ and $\mathrm{d}(g)=\max\left\{r\in\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\cup\{\infty\}\bigm| g\in G_r\right\}$ for all appropriate g. Similar (but $(\mathbb{R}\cup\{\infty\})$-valued) functions are defined on $\operatorname{Lie}(G)$. If necessary, we will denote these functions by $\mathrm{d}_{G,x}$ and d_G to indicate the dependence on G.

If a group $\mathcal{G}$ has a filtration $(\mathcal{G}_i)_{i\in I}$, then we shall frequently write $\mathcal{G}_{i:j}$ in place of $\mathcal{G}_i/\mathcal{G}_j$ when $\mathcal{G}_j \subseteq \mathcal{G}_i$ (even if the quotient is not a group). For example, we put $F_{r:t} = F_r/F_t$, $U_{\varphi_1:\varphi_2} = U_{\varphi_1}/U_{\varphi_2}$, and $G_{x,r:t} = G_{x,r}/G_{x,t}$ for $r \leq t$ (and $r \geq 0$, in the last case) and for affine F-roots φ_1 and φ_2 such that $\dot{\varphi}_1 = \dot{\varphi}_2$ and $\varphi_1 \leq \varphi_2$.

Definition 3.5. There is a (not necessarily connected) reductive $\mathfrak{f}$-group G_x such that $\operatorname{stab}_{\mathbf{G}(E)}(x)/\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,0+} = \mathsf{G}_x(\mathfrak{f}_E)$ whenever E/F is an unramified extension. If necessary, we will write G_x^F instead of just G_x to indicate the dependence on the field F.

In the notation of Definition 3.5, $G_{x,0:0+}$ is the group of $\mathfrak{f}$-rational points of G_x°. (In the notation of [46, §3], $\mathsf{G}_x = \overline{G}_x/R_{\mathrm{un}}(\overline{G}_x)$ and $\mathsf{G}_x^\circ = \overline{G}_x^{\mathrm{red}}$. Most authors use G_x to denote what we are calling G_x°.)

If $\widetilde{\mathbf{G}}$ is F-anisotropic, then $\operatorname{Lie}(G)_{x,r} = \operatorname{Lie}(G)_r$ and $G_{x,r} = G_r$ for all $x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F)$ and $r \in \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}$ (respectively, $r \in \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{\geq 0}$). In particular, G has a canonical filtration. We have already seen what this filtration looks like when $\mathbf{G}$ is a torus. In any case, if $\mathbf{S}$ is a maximal F-split torus in $\mathbf{G}$, then $C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S})$ is F-anisotropic modulo its center. For any constant $\widetilde{\mathbb{R}}$-valued function $\varphi = r$ on $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$, we put $\mathfrak{u}_\varphi = \operatorname{Lie}(C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S}))(E)_r$ and (if $r \geq 0$) $U_\varphi = C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S})(E)_r$. If φ is an affine function on $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$ whose gradient does not belong to $\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S})$, then we put $U_\varphi = U_{\varphi+} = \{1\}$ and $\mathfrak{u}_\varphi = \mathfrak{u}_{\varphi+} = \{0\}$.

3.5. **Filtrations and descent.** In this section, we gather together some results, most of which are well known. Suppose

- $(x, r) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F) \times \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{\geq 0}$,
- E/F is a discretely valued algebraic extension, and
- $\mathbf{M}$ is an F-Levi subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$.

(Throughout, we will call a subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$ an *F-Levi subgroup* if it is a Levi component of some parabolic F-subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$. An F-subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$ which is a Levi component of some parabolic E-subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$ (for some extension E/F) will be called an *E-Levi F-subgroup*.)

Recall that we have defined functions d and d_x on certain subsets of G. Denote by d_M and $\mathrm{d}_{M,x}$ the corresponding functions defined on the corresponding subsets of M. For any discretely valued algebraic extension K/F, denote by d^K and d_x^K the corresponding functions defined on the corresponding subsets of $\mathbf{G}(K)$.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $\mathbf{T}$ be an F-torus. When E/F is tame and $r > 0$, $T \cap \mathbf{T}(E)_r = T_r$. When E/F is separable, $T_0 \cap \mathbf{T}(E)_r = T_r$. In general, there is some finite Galois extension K/E such that $T_0 \cap \mathbf{T}(K)_r = T_r$.*

Proof. For any extension K/F, we have by the definition of the filtration that $T_0 \cap \mathbf{T}(K)_r \subseteq T_r$. If $T_0 \subseteq \mathbf{T}(K)_0$, then also $T_r \subseteq \mathbf{T}(K)_r$. If E/F is separable, then fix an element $t \in T_0$. By Lemma 3.2, there is a complete subfield F' of F such that

- F/F' is unramified,
- $\mathbf{T}$ is defined over F', and
- $t \in \mathbf{T}(F')$.

In particular, $t \in \mathbf{T}(F)_0^{\mathrm{Gal}(F/F')}$, which, by definition, is $\mathbf{T}(F')_0$. By another application of Lemma 3.2, there is a finite subextension E'/F' of E/F' such that E/E' is unramified. By Lemma 2.1.2 of [4], $t \in \mathbf{T}(E')_0$. Since E/E' is unramified, $\mathbf{T}(E')_0 \subseteq \mathbf{T}(E)_0$ by definition. Thus, $t \in \mathbf{T}(E)_0$; so $T_0 \subseteq \mathbf{T}(E)_0$. If $\mathbf{T}$ is K-split, then $\mathbf{T}(K)_0 = \mathbf{T}(K)_{\mathrm{b}}$, hence contains T_0. The third statement follows.

If $\operatorname{char} \mathfrak{f} = 0$, then $\mathbf{T}$ and E/F are tame, so Proposition 4.7.2 of [49] gives the first statement in this case. The first statement will follow in general once we know that $T \cap \mathbf{T}(E)_{0+} \subseteq T_0$ when E/F is tame and $p := \operatorname{char} \mathfrak{f} > 0$. Since $\mathbf{T}(E)_{0+} \subseteq \mathbf{T}(\widetilde{E})_{0+}$, where $\widetilde{E}/F$ is the Galois closure of E/F, we may, and hence do, assume that E/F is Galois. Since $T_0 = \mathbf{T}(F^{\mathrm{un}})_0^{\mathrm{Gal}(F^{\mathrm{un}}/F)}$ by definition, it suffices to assume that $F = F^{\mathrm{un}}$. In the notation of [23, §7.3], with $L = F$ and $L' = E$ (so, in particular, β is the inclusion of T in $\mathbf{T}(E)$), we have by (7.3.2) of loc. cit. that

$$\alpha(w_{\mathbf{T}(E)}(\beta(t))) = \alpha(N(w_T(t))) = [E : F]w_T(t)$$

for $t \in T$. ([23] works over the completion of the maximal unramified extension of a p-adic field; but, as in [33], the same reasoning works for any Henselian field with algebraically closed residue field, such as F.) By Lemma 2.3 of [33], $T_0 = \ker w_T$ and $\mathbf{T}(E)_0 = \ker w_{\mathbf{T}(E)}$, so $\gamma^{[E:F]} \in T_0$ whenever $\gamma \in T \cap \mathbf{T}(E)_0$. If further $\gamma \in \mathbf{T}(E)_{0+}$, then, since the sequence $(\gamma^{p^n})_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}}$ in T tends to the identity element, and T_0 is an open subgroup of T, there is some positive integer N such that $\gamma^{p^N} \in T_0$. Since $[E : F]$ and p are coprime, we have that $\gamma \in T_0$. □

Lemma 3.7. *If E/F is separable, then $\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,r} \cap G \supseteq G_{x,r}$. If E/F is unramified, or $r > 0$ and E/F is tame, then we have equality.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.2 and the definition of the filtration, $\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,r} \cap G$ is the union of all the subgroups of the form $\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,r} \cap \mathbf{G}(F')$, where F' is a complete subfield of F, L is a finite extension of F' contained in E, and E/L is unramified. Thus, we may, and hence do, assume that E/F is finite, and that F (hence E) is complete. For $r = 0$, the containment is Lemma 2.1.2 of [4]. For $r > 0$, Proposition 1.4.1 of [1] shows that the containment always holds. For E/F unramified, equality follows from the definition of the filtration. For $r > 0$ and E/F tame, equality is proven in Proposition 1.4.2 of [1] (using the conclusion of Lemma 3.6). $\square$

Lemma 3.8. *$G_r \cap M = M_r$, and, if $x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{M}, F)$, then $G_{x,r} \cap M = M_{x,r}$.*

In the statement of the lemma, we have regarded $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{M}, F)$ as a subset of $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F)$, as in [16] (or Definition 4.3 below).

Proof. Once we know the results for all $r < \infty$, the results for $r = \infty$ will follow. Therefore, we may, and hence do, assume that $r < \infty$.

It is clear (from the second part of the lemma) that $M_r \subseteq G_r \cap M$. Choose an element $g \in G_r \cap M$. Then there is some $y \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F)$ such that $g \in G_{y,r}$. By Lemma 3.2, there is a complete subfield F' of F such that

- $\mathbf{G}$ and g are defined over F',
- $\mathbf{M}$ is an F'-Levi subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$,
- $y \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F')$, and
- F/F' is unramified.

Then, by Lemma 3.7, $g \in \mathbf{G}(F')_{y,r} \cap \mathbf{M}(F')$. By Theorem 4.1.5 of [16], $g \in \mathbf{M}(F')_{y,r}$. By another application of Lemma 3.7, $g \in M_r$.

By a similar argument, we may, and hence do, assume for the second statement that F is complete. For $r = 0$, the statement is Lemma 4.2.2 of [16]. For $r > 0$, it is Theorem 4.2 of [29]. $\square$

Lemma 3.9. *When E/F is separable, $\mathbf{G}(E)_r \cap G \supseteq G_r$. If E/F is unramified, or $r > 0$ and E/F is tame, then we have equality.*

Proof. Once we know the result for all $r < \infty$, it follows for $r = \infty$; so we assume throughout that $r < \infty$. In this case, the containment follows from Lemma 3.7.

Suppose that $\gamma \in \mathbf{G}(E)_r \cap G$. Then $\gamma \in \mathbf{G}(\widetilde{E})_r \cap G$, where $\widetilde{E}$ is the Galois closure of E over F. Since $\widetilde{E}/F$ is unramified (respectively, tame) if E/F is, we may, and hence do, assume that E/F is Galois. Choose $x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, E)$ with $\gamma \in \mathbf{G}(E)_{x,r}$. Then $\gamma \in \mathbf{G}(E)_{\sigma x,r}$ for $\sigma \in \operatorname{Gal}(E/F)$, so $\gamma \in \mathbf{G}(E)_{\tilde{x},r}$, where $\tilde{x}$ is the center of mass of the $\operatorname{Gal}(E/F)$-orbit of x. Suppose that E/F is tame. Then $\tilde{x} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, E)^{\operatorname{Gal}(E/F)} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F)$. If E/F is unramified or $r > 0$, then we have by another application of Lemma 3.7 that $\gamma \in G_{\tilde{x},r}$. That is, $\mathbf{G}(E)_r \cap G \subseteq G_r$. The reverse containment being obvious, we have equality, as desired. $\square$

Lemma 3.10. *If $\mathbf{S}$ is a maximal F-split torus in $\mathbf{G}$ and $x, y \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$, then, for any $g \in G_{x,r} \cap G_{y,r+}$, we have that $gG_{x,r+} \subseteq G_{z,r+}$ for $z \in (x, y)$ sufficiently close to x; and there is a parabolic F-subgroup $\mathbf{P}$ of $\mathbf{G}$ containing $\mathbf{S}$ (depending on g) such that $g \in R_{\text{un}}(P) \cdot G_{x,r+}$, where $R_{\text{un}}(\mathbf{P})$ is the unipotent radical of $\mathbf{P}$.*

Here, (x, y) denotes the open line segment between x and y in $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.2, there is a complete subfield F' of F such that

- $\mathbf{G}$ and $\mathbf{S}$ are defined over F',
- $\mathbf{S}$ is F'-split,
- g is defined over F', and
- F/F' is unramified.

By Lemma 3.7, $g \in \mathbf{G}(F')_{x,r} \cap \mathbf{G}(F')_{y,r+}$. Thus, we may, and hence do, assume that F is complete.

The first statement is proved in the proof of Corollary 3.7.10 of [3]. The second is proved in the "$\subset$" part of the proof of Lemma 4.3.2 of [16] for $r = 0$, and in the proof of Lemma 3.7.6 of [3] for $r > 0$. □

Lemma 3.11. $\operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x}) \cap G_0 = G_{x,0}$.

Proof. Let $g \in \operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x}) \cap G_0$. By definition, G acts by translations on the factor $V_F(Z(\mathbf{G}))$ in $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F) = \mathcal{B}^{\text{red}}(\mathbf{G}, F) \times V_F(Z(\mathbf{G}))$. Since G_0 consists of bounded elements, it acts trivially on $V_F(Z(\mathbf{G}))$, so in fact $g \in \operatorname{stab}_G(x)$. Further, $g \in G_{y,0}$ for some $y \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F)$. From Lemma 3.2, we may pick a complete subfield F' of F such that

- $\mathbf{G}$ is defined over F',
- F/F' is unramified,
- $x, y \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F')$, and
- $g \in \mathbf{G}(F')$.

Then $g \in \operatorname{stab}_{\mathbf{G}(F')}(x)$, and, from Lemma 3.7, $g \in \mathbf{G}(F')_{y,0} \subseteq \mathbf{G}(F')_0$. By Lemma 4.2.1 of [16], $\mathbf{G}(F')_0 \cap \operatorname{stab}_{\mathbf{G}(F')}(x) = \mathbf{G}(F')_{x,0} \subseteq G_{x,0}$. The reverse containment, hence equality, is obvious. □

3.6. **The effect of the center on depth and degeneracy.** Fix $(x, r) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F) \times \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{\geq 0}$.

Lemma 3.12. *$Z(G) \cap G_{x,r} = Z(G) \cap G_{y,r}$ for any $y \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F)$.*

Proof. By Théorème 7.4.18 of [12], there exists a maximal F-split torus $\mathbf{S}$ such that $x, y \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$. By Lemma 3.8,

$$Z(G) \cap G_{x,r} = Z(G) \cap (C_G(S) \cap G_{x,r}) = Z(G) \cap C_G(S)_r\,,$$

and similarly for $Z(G) \cap G_{y,r}$. □

Lemma 3.13. *If $z \in Z(G)$, then $zG_{x,r} \cap G_r \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $z \in G_{x,r}$.*

Proof. The 'if' part is clear.

For the 'only if' part, suppose that $zG_{x,r} \cap G_r \neq \emptyset$. Since Lemma 3.11 gives $zG_{x,r} \cap G_0 \subseteq \operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x}) \cap G_0 = G_{x,0}$, we have $z \in G_{x,0}$. Put $t = \mathrm{d}_x(z)$. By Lemma 3.12, $Z(G) \cap G_{y,t+}$ is independent of $y \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F)$, so we have that $t = \mathrm{d}(z)$. If $t \geq r$, then we are done, so assume $t < r$. From Lemma 3.10, all elements of $zG_{x,r} \subseteq zG_{x,t+}$ have depth t, so $zG_{x,r} \cap G_r$ is empty, which is a contradiction. $\square$

Corollary 3.14. $Z(G)G_{x,r} \cap G_r = G_{x,r}$.

Lemma 3.15. *If* $g \in G_{x,r}$ *and* $gG_{x,r+} \cap Z(G)G_{r+} \neq \emptyset$, *then* $g \in Z(G)G_{r+}$.

Proof. Suppose that $z \in Z(G)$ is such that $gG_{x,r+} \cap zG_{r+} \neq \emptyset$. Then $\emptyset \neq z^{-1}gG_{x,r+} \cap G_{r+} \subseteq z^{-1}G_{x,r} \cap G_r$, so, by Lemma 3.13, $z \in G_{x,r}$. Therefore, $z^{-1}g \in G_{x,r}$, so Lemma 3.10 implies that $z^{-1}g \in G_{r+}$. $\square$

4. TAMENESS AND COMPATIBLE FILTRATION

Remark 4.1. Let $\mathbf{N}$ be a closed normal F-subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$. By Theorem AG.17.3 and Proposition 6.5 of [7], the map $\mathbf{G} \longrightarrow \mathbf{G}/\mathbf{N}$ is a submersion of varieties. Fix an open subset U of G. By Lemma 3.2, $U = \varinjlim(U \cap \mathbf{G}(F'))$, the limit taken over all complete subfields F' of F over which $\mathbf{G}$ is defined. For such a field F', the induced map $\mathbf{G}(F') \longrightarrow (\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{N})(F')$ is a submersion of analytic manifolds, hence, by Theorem II.III.10(2)(2) of [38, p. 85], an open map. Thus the image $\overline{U \cap \mathbf{G}(F')}$ of $U \cap \mathbf{G}(F')$ in $(\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{N})(F')$ is open there; so the image $\overline{U} = \varinjlim \overline{U \cap \mathbf{G}(F')}$ of U in $(\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{N})(F) = \varinjlim(\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{N})(F')$ is open there. That is, $G \longrightarrow (\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{N})(F)$ is an open map.

Denote by $\overline{G}$ the image of G in $(\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{N})(F)$, with the subspace topology. Then $\overline{G}$ is

- open in $(\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{N})(F)$;
- closed in $(\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{N})(F)$; and
- homeomorphic to G/N.

If F is complete (respectively, locally compact), then so are G and (**G**/**N**)(F), hence also $\overline{G}$.

Definition 4.2. Suppose that $\mathbf{N}$ is a closed normal F-subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$. Say that $\mathbf{G}$ is *F-tame* (respectively, *F-tame modulo* $\mathbf{N}$) if it contains a maximal F-torus $\mathbf{T}$ such that $\mathbf{T}$ (respectively, $\mathbf{T}/(\mathbf{N} \cap \mathbf{T})$) splits over a tame extension of F. If $\mathbf{S}$ is an F-torus in $\mathbf{G}$, we will often say that $\mathbf{S}$ is *F-tame modulo center* instead of F-tame modulo $Z(\mathbf{G})$ if $\mathbf{G}$ is understood from the context.

Say that an element $\gamma \in G$ is *F-tame in* $\mathbf{G}$ (respectively, *F-tame in* $\mathbf{G}$ *modulo* $\mathbf{N}$) if it is semisimple and $C_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma)^\circ$ is F-tame (respectively, F-tame modulo $\mathbf{N}$). We will omit "in $\mathbf{G}$", and say that γ is *F-tame modulo center* instead of F-tame modulo $Z(\mathbf{G})^\circ$, if $\mathbf{G}$ is understood from the context.

We will frequently say *tame* instead of F-tame if F is understood.

Note that a torus which is F-tame modulo a group $\mathbf{N}$ need not actually contain $\mathbf{N}$. If $\mathbf{N}'$ is another normal subgroup such that $\mathbf{N}' \supseteq \mathbf{N}$ and $\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{N}' \longrightarrow \mathbf{G}/\mathbf{N}$ is a central isogeny, then, by Corollaire 1.9(a) of [9], we have that an F-torus or element of G is F-tame modulo $\mathbf{N}$ if and only if it is F-tame modulo $\mathbf{N}'$. In particular, F-tameness modulo $Z(\mathbf{G})$ is the same as F-tameness modulo $Z(\mathbf{G})^\circ$.

Definition 4.3. Suppose that $i : \mathbf{H} \longrightarrow \mathbf{G}$ is a closed embedding of reductive F-groups. Given a discretely valued algebraic extension E/F, we say that a map $i_E : \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}, E) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, E)$ *preserves filtrations over* F if

(1) i_E is an $\operatorname{Aut}(E/F)$-equivariant isometry;
(2) $i_E(hx) = i(h)i_E(x)$ for $h \in \mathbf{H}(E)$ and $x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}, E)$;
(3) for every maximal E^{tr}-split E-torus $\mathbf{S_H} \subseteq \mathbf{H}$, there is a maximal E^{tr}-split E-torus $\mathbf{S_G} \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ such that $i(\mathbf{S_H}) \subseteq \mathbf{S_G}$ and i_E restricts to an affine injection of $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S_H})^{\operatorname{Gal}(E^{\mathrm{tr}}/E)} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}, E)$ into $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S_G})^{\operatorname{Gal}(E^{\mathrm{tr}}/E)} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, E)$; and
(4) for all $(x, r) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}, E) \times \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{>0}$, $\mathbf{H}(E)_{x,r}$ is the preimage in $\mathbf{H}(E)$ of $\mathbf{G}(E)_{i_E(x),r}$.

We say that an F-embedding $i : \mathbf{H} \longrightarrow \mathbf{G}$ of reductive F-groups is *filtration preserving over* F if there is a system

$$(i_E\colon \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}, E) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, E))_{E/F \text{ a discretely valued separable extension}}$$

of filtration-preserving embeddings of buildings such that, for all pairs E/F and E'/F of discretely valued separable extensions with $E' \subseteq E$, $i_E\big|_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H},E')} = i_{E'}$. If $\mathbf{H}$ is a reductive F-subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$ such that the inclusion $\mathbf{H} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{G}$ is filtration preserving over F, then we say that $\mathbf{H}$ is a *compatibly filtered* F*-subgroup* of $\mathbf{G}$.

When such a system exists, we will often use it to identify the buildings of $\mathbf{H}$ (over various fields) with subsets of those of $\mathbf{G}$, using the same letter for an element of $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}, F)$ and its image in $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F)$.

For every discretely valued separable extension E/F, there is a canonical $\mathbf{H}(E)$- and $\operatorname{Aut}(E/F)$-equivariant isomorphism $i_E : \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}^\circ, E) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}, E)$. We have $\mathbf{H}(E)_{i_E(x),r} := \mathbf{H}^\circ(E)_{x,r}$ for $(x, r) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}^\circ, E) \times \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{\geq 0}$, and the maps i_E are compatible in the sense of Definition 4.3. Thus $\mathbf{H}^\circ$ is a compatibly filtered F-subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$ if $\mathbf{H}$ is.

Note that, if $\mathbf{H}$ is a compatibly filtered F-subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$ and $\mathbf{L}$ is a compatibly filtered F-subgroup of $\mathbf{H}$, then $\mathbf{L}$ is a compatibly filtered F-subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$.

Lemma 4.4. *Suppose that* $\mathbf{H}$ *is a compatibly filtered* F*-subgroup of* $\mathbf{G}$ *and* $x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}, F)$. *Then* $H_{x,0} \subseteq G_{x,0}$.

Proof. By Definition 4.3, $\mathbf{H}(F^{\mathrm{un}})_{x,0+} = \mathrm{stab}_{\mathbf{H}(F^{\mathrm{un}})}(x) \cap \mathbf{G}(F^{\mathrm{un}})_{x,0+}$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{H}_x(\bar{\mathfrak{f}}) &= \mathrm{stab}_{\mathbf{H}(F^{\mathrm{un}})}(x)/\mathbf{H}(F^{\mathrm{un}})_{x,0+} \\ &\subseteq \mathrm{stab}_{\mathbf{G}(F^{\mathrm{un}})}(x)/\mathbf{G}(F^{\mathrm{un}})_{x,0+} = \mathsf{G}_x(\bar{\mathfrak{f}}),\end{aligned}$$

so

$$\mathbf{H}(F^{\mathrm{un}})_{x,0:0+} = \mathsf{H}_x^\circ(\bar{\mathfrak{f}}) \subseteq \mathsf{G}_x^\circ(\bar{\mathfrak{f}}) = \mathbf{G}(F^{\mathrm{un}})_{x,0:0+}\,.$$

In particular, $\mathbf{H}(F^{\mathrm{un}})_{x,0} \subseteq \mathbf{G}(F^{\mathrm{un}})_{x,0}$. Since $H_{x,0} = \mathbf{H}(F^{\mathrm{un}})_{x,0}^{\mathrm{Gal}(F^{\mathrm{un}}/F)}$, and similarly for $G_{x,0}$, we have the desired containment. □

Lemma 4.5. *If E/F^{un} is an algebraic extension, then any E-split F-torus in $\mathbf{G}$ is contained in some maximal E-split torus in $\mathbf{G}$ which is defined over F.*

We emphasize that the torus in question is maximal among E-split tori, not just among E-split F-tori.

Proof. Let E'/F be the maximal Galois subextension of E/F. Since F^{un}/F is Galois, E' contains F^{un}. Since an F-torus is E-split if and only if it is E'-split, we may, and hence do, assume, upon replacing E by E', that E/F is Galois.

Fix an E-split F-torus $\mathbf{S}'$. Since the E-split ranks of $\mathbf{G}$ and $C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S}')$ are the same, upon replacing $\mathbf{G}$ by $C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S}')$, we may, and hence do, assume that $\mathbf{S}'$ is central in $\mathbf{G}$. Denote by $\mathbf{S}'_{\mathrm{spl}}$ the maximal F-split subtorus of $\mathbf{S}'$. By Corollaire 5.1.12 of [13], there exists a maximal F^{un}-split F-torus $\mathbf{S}'^\sharp$ in $\mathbf{G}$ containing $\mathbf{S}'_{\mathrm{spl}}$. Since $\mathbf{S}'^\sharp$ is E-split, it is contained in a maximal E-split torus $\mathbf{S}^\sharp$ in $\mathbf{G}$. In particular, $\mathbf{S}^\sharp$ is a maximal E-split torus in $C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S}'^\sharp)$. Since $\mathbf{G}$ is F^{un}-quasisplit, $C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S}'^\sharp)$ is a maximal F-torus. In particular, it has a unique maximal E-split subtorus, namely $\mathbf{S}^\sharp$; so $\mathbf{S}^\sharp$ is $\mathrm{Gal}(E/F)$-stable, hence an F-torus. Finally, since $\mathbf{S}'$ is E-split, there is an element $g \in \mathbf{G}(E)$ such that ${}^g\mathbf{S}' \subseteq \mathbf{S}^\sharp$. Since $\mathbf{S}'$ is central in $\mathbf{G}$, we have that ${}^g\mathbf{S}' = \mathbf{S}'$. □

The following proposition is an example of a situation in which a subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$ is compatibly filtered over F.

Proposition 4.6. *Suppose that $\mathbf{H}$ is a connected reductive F-subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$ such that the absolute ranks of $\mathbf{H}$ and $\mathbf{G}$ are the same, and there is some tame extension L/F^{un} such that $\mathbf{H}$ and $\mathbf{G}$ have the same L-split rank. Then $\mathbf{H}$ is a compatibly filtered F-subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$. Moreover, for any discretely valued separable extension E/F, the image of $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}, E)$ in $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, E)$ is independent of the choice of filtration-preserving embeddings over F.*

Remark 4.7. We will actually prove a stronger uniqueness statement; namely, that, if (i_E) and (i'_E) are two compatible systems as in Definition 4.3, then there is some $\lambda \in \mathbf{X}_*^F(Z(\mathbf{H})) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$ such that, for all discretely valued separable extensions E/F, $i_E(x + \lambda) = i'_E(x)$ for $x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}, E)$.

Proof. By Lemma 4.5, there exists a maximal L-split torus in $\mathbf{H}$ which is defined over F. Upon replacing L by the compositum with F^{un} of the splitting field of such a torus, we may, and hence do, assume that L is discretely valued and strictly Henselian, hence that $\mathbf{G}$ and $\mathbf{H}$ are L-quasisplit.

Let E/F be a discretely valued separable extension. Assume first that $E \supseteq L$ (hence that E is strictly Henselian); we will show how to handle arbitrary E later. Let $\mathbf{S}$ be a maximal E-split torus in $\mathbf{H}$. By Lemma A.12, $\mathbf{S}$ is also a maximal E-split torus in $\mathbf{G}$. Since they have the same underlying affine space, there is a natural affine isometry $i_{E,\mathbf{S}}$ of ${}_{\mathbf{H}}\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$ with ${}_{\mathbf{G}}\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$. Since $N_{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{S})(E) \subseteq N_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S})(E)$ and $\mathrm{Aut}(E/F)$ act on $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$ by affine transformations, this identification is $N_{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{S})(E)$- and $\mathrm{Aut}(E/F)$-equivariant. If K/E is a further discretely valued separable extension and $\mathbf{S}^\sharp$ is a maximal K-split torus containing $\mathbf{S}$, then $i_{K,\mathbf{S}^\sharp}$ restricts to $i_{E,\mathbf{S}}$.

We recall from [46, §1.4] (where they are denoted by X_φ) the definition of the affine root subgroups U_φ. This will be useful later in the proof. Suppose $a \in \Phi(\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{S}) \subseteq \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S})$. From Lemma A.13, the root subgroups of $\mathbf{G}$ and $\mathbf{H}$ associated to a are the same, so we may write $\mathbf{U}_a$ without ambiguity. Suppose φ is an affine function on $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$ such that $\dot\varphi = a$. If $a = 0$, then recall that $U_\varphi = \mathbf{T}(E)_r$, where $\mathbf{T}$ is the unique maximal torus in $\mathbf{H}$ (or $\mathbf{G}$) containing $\mathbf{S}$ and r is the value of the constant function φ. This is obviously independent of whether the ambient group is $\mathbf{H}$ or $\mathbf{G}$. If $a \in \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S})$, then, for $u \in \mathbf{U}_a(E) \smallsetminus \{1\}$, the set $\mathbf{U}_{-a}(\overline{F})u\mathbf{U}_{-a}(\overline{F}) \cap N_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S})(\overline{F})$ has only one element, say $n_{\mathbf{G},\mathbf{S}}(u)$ (which actually lies in $\mathbf{U}_{-a}(E)u\mathbf{U}_{-a}(E) \cap N_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S})(E)$). This element uniquely determines an affine function $\varphi_{\mathbf{G},\mathbf{S}}(u)$ on $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$ such that $\dot\varphi_{\mathbf{G},\mathbf{S}}(u) = a$ and $\varphi_{\mathbf{G},\mathbf{S}}(u)$ vanishes on the hyperplane fixed by $n_{\mathbf{G},\mathbf{S}}(u)$. (Note that, since the action of $N_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S})(E)$ on $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$ depends on our choice of valuation ord, so does this hyperplane.) Then we put $U_\varphi^{\mathbf{G}} = \{1\} \cup \bigl\{u \in \mathbf{U}_a(E) \smallsetminus \{1\} \bigm| \varphi_{\mathbf{G},\mathbf{S}}(u) \ge \varphi\bigr\}$. We define $U_\varphi^{\mathbf{H}}$ (and the associated notation) similarly. Since $n_{\mathbf{H},\mathbf{S}}(u) \in \mathbf{U}_{-a}(\overline{F})u\mathbf{U}_{-a}(\overline{F}) \cap N_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S})(\overline{F})$, in fact $n_{\mathbf{H},\mathbf{S}}(u) = n_{\mathbf{G},\mathbf{S}}(u)$, so $\varphi_{\mathbf{H},\mathbf{S}}(u) = \varphi_{\mathbf{G},\mathbf{S}}(u)$ for $u \in \mathbf{U}_a(E) \smallsetminus \{1\}$. Thus, $U_\varphi^{\mathbf{G}} = U_\varphi^{\mathbf{H}}$, and we may use the notation U_φ without ambiguity.

Now choose an element $x_{\mathbf{H}} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}, E)$. Then there is some $h \in \mathbf{H}(E)$ such that $y_{\mathbf{H}} := h^{-1}x_{\mathbf{H}} \in {}_{\mathbf{H}}\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$. Put $y_{\mathbf{G}} := i_{E,\mathbf{S}}(y_{\mathbf{H}})$ and $x_{\mathbf{G}} = hy_{\mathbf{G}}$.

We claim that $x_{\mathbf{G}}$ is independent of the choice of $h \in \mathbf{H}(E)$ as above. Indeed, if also $h' \in \mathbf{H}(E)$ satisfies $y'_{\mathbf{H}} := h'^{-1}x_{\mathbf{H}} \in {}_{\mathbf{H}}\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$, then $h^{-1}h'$ carries $y'_{\mathbf{H}}$ to $y_{\mathbf{H}}$. By Lemma 3.3, there are $n \in N_{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{S})(E)$ and $h_0 \in \mathbf{H}(E)_{y'_{\mathbf{H}},0}$ such that $h^{-1}h' = nh_0$. In particular, $ny'_{\mathbf{H}} = y_{\mathbf{H}}$; so also $ny'_{\mathbf{G}} = y_{\mathbf{G}}$, where $y'_{\mathbf{G}} = i_{E,\mathbf{S}}(y'_{\mathbf{H}})$.

Now $\mathbf{H}(E)_{y'_{\mathbf{H}},0}$ is generated by those $U_\varphi = U_\varphi^{\mathbf{H}}$ for which $\varphi \in \widetilde{\Psi}(\mathbf{H},\mathbf{S}) \subseteq \widetilde{\Psi}(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{S})$ and $\varphi(y'_{\mathbf{H}}) \geq 0$. Since $y'_{\mathbf{H}} \in {}_{\mathbf{H}}\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$ and $y'_{\mathbf{G}} \in {}_{\mathbf{G}}\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$ correspond to the same point of the underlying affine space $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S}^\sharp)$, every such φ also satisfies $\varphi(y'_{\mathbf{G}}) \geq 0$, so $U_\varphi \subseteq \mathbf{G}(E)_{y'_{\mathbf{G}},0}$. That is, $\mathbf{H}(E)_{y'_{\mathbf{H}},0} \subseteq \mathbf{G}(E)_{y'_{\mathbf{G}},0}$. In particular, $(h^{-1}h')y'_{\mathbf{G}} = ny'_{\mathbf{G}} = y_{\mathbf{G}}$, i.e., $h'y'_{\mathbf{G}} = hy_{\mathbf{G}} = x_{\mathbf{G}}$.

Thus we may unambiguously put $i_E(x_{\mathbf{H}}) = x_{\mathbf{G}}$. If K/E is a further discretely valued separable extension and $\mathbf{S}^\sharp$ a maximal K-split torus containing $\mathbf{S}$, then $y_{\mathbf{H}} \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S}) \subseteq \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S}^\sharp)$ and $i_{K,\mathbf{S}^\sharp}(y_{\mathbf{H}}) = i_{E,\mathbf{S}}(y_{\mathbf{H}}) = y_{\mathbf{G}}$, so the same process puts $i_K(x_{\mathbf{H}}) = hy_{\mathbf{G}} = i_E(x_{\mathbf{H}})$.

By Remark 3.4, for $r \in \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{>0}$,

$$\mathbf{G}(E)_{y_{\mathbf{G}},r} = \mathbf{H}(E)_{y_{\mathbf{H}},r} \times \prod U_\varphi\,,$$

the latter product taken over those $\varphi \in \widetilde{\Psi}(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{S}) \smallsetminus \widetilde{\Psi}(\mathbf{H},\mathbf{S})$ such that $\varphi(y_{\mathbf{H}}) = r$. In particular, clearly $\mathbf{H}(E)_{y_{\mathbf{H}},r} \subseteq \mathbf{G}(E)_{y_{\mathbf{G}},r} \cap \mathbf{H}(E)$. On the other hand, if $g := h\prod u_\varphi \in \mathbf{G}(E)_{y_{\mathbf{G}},r}$ belongs to $\mathbf{H}(E)$, then so does $g^{-1}h$; and the image (under the multiplication map $\mathsf{m}_{\mathbf{H}}$ of Lemma A.14) of $(g^{-1}h, (u_\varphi))$ is 1. Since the map in question is injective, we have that $g = h \in \mathbf{H}(E)_{y_{\mathbf{H}},r}$. Thus $\mathbf{H}(E)_{y_{\mathbf{H}},r} = \mathbf{G}(E)_{y_{\mathbf{G}},r} \cap \mathbf{H}(E)$, so

(∗)

$$\mathbf{H}(E)_{x_{\mathbf{H}},r} = {}^h\mathbf{H}(E)_{y_{\mathbf{H}},r} = {}^h\mathbf{G}(E)_{y_{\mathbf{G}},r} \cap \mathbf{H}(E) = \mathbf{G}(E)_{i_E(x_{\mathbf{H}}),r} \cap \mathbf{H}(E).$$

By construction, i_E is $\mathbf{H}(E)$-equivariant, hence independent of the choice of $\mathbf{S}$. It is easy to see that it is also $\operatorname{Aut}(E/F)$-equivariant. Note that i_E is an isometry when restricted to ${}_{\mathbf{H}}\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$. By Proposition 2.3.1 of [12], any pair of points of $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H},E)$ may be (simultaneously) conjugated into ${}_{\mathbf{H}}\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$ by a point of $\mathbf{H}(E)$. Thus, the $\mathbf{H}(E)$-equivariance of i_E implies that it is an isometry on all of $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H},E)$.

Now drop the assumption that E contains L, and assume only that E/F is some discretely valued separable extension. Pick a discretely valued tame extension K/EL such that K/F is Galois. Then we have a $\operatorname{Gal}(K/F)$-equivariant isometry $i_K : \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H},K) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G},K)$, which restricts to an $\operatorname{Aut}(E/F)$-equivariant isometry $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H},E) = \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H},K)^{\operatorname{Gal}(K/E)} \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G},K)^{\operatorname{Gal}(K/E)} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G},E)$, independent of the choice of K. We define i_E to be this latter map. By (∗) and Lemma 3.7, for $(x,r) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H},E) \times \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{>0}$, we have $\mathbf{H}(E)_{x,r} = \mathbf{G}(E)_{i_E(x),r} \cap \mathbf{H}(E)$.

Now suppose that $\mathbf{S}'$ is a maximal E^{tr}-split E-torus in $\mathbf{H}$. By Lemma 4.5, $\mathbf{S}'$ is a maximal E^{tr}-split torus in $\mathbf{H}$, hence, by Lemma A.12, in $\mathbf{G}$. Denote by K/E the splitting field of $\mathbf{S}'$. Then i_E is a restriction of i_K, and the restriction of i_K to $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S}')^{\operatorname{Gal}(K/E)} = \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S}')^{\operatorname{Gal}(E^{\mathrm{tr}}/E)}$ agrees with the restriction of the affine injection (indeed, isomorphism) $i_{K,\mathbf{S}'}$.

We have constructed one compatible system (i_E) of filtration-preserving embeddings over F. Suppose that (i'_E) is another such system. Fix a discretely valued separable extension E/F. As above, we may find a discretely valued tame Galois extension K/E and a K-split E-torus $\mathbf{S}'$ such that $\mathbf{S}'$ is an E^{tr}-split torus maximal in $\mathbf{H}$ and $\mathbf{G}$. We may, and hence do, suppose that K is strictly Henselian. By Definition 4.3(3), $i_K(x+\lambda) = i_K(x) + \lambda$ and $i'_K(x+\lambda) = i'_K(x) + \lambda$ for $x \in {}_{\mathbf{H}}\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S}')$ and $\lambda \in \mathbf{X}_*^K(\mathbf{S}') \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$; and, since the unique E^{tr}-split E-torus in $\mathbf{G}$ containing $\mathbf{S}'$ is $\mathbf{S}'$ itself, the image under each of i_K and i'_K of ${}_{\mathbf{H}}\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S}')$ is ${}_{\mathbf{G}}\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S}')$. Since ${}_{\mathbf{H}}\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S}')$ and ${}_{\mathbf{G}}\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S}')$ are affine spaces under $\mathbf{X}_*^K(\mathbf{S}') \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$, there is some $\lambda_E \in \mathbf{X}_*^K(\mathbf{S}') \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$ such that $i_K(x+\lambda_E) = i'_K(x)$ for all $x \in {}_{\mathbf{H}}\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S}')$. Fix, arbitrarily, a point $o \in {}_{\mathbf{H}}\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S}')$. Since K is strictly Henselian and $\mathbf{H}(K)_{o+\lambda_E,r} = \mathbf{G}(K)_{i_K(o+\lambda_E),r} \cap \mathbf{H}(K) = \mathbf{G}(K)_{i'_K(o),r} \cap \mathbf{H}(K) = \mathbf{H}(K)_{o,r}$ for $r \in \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{>0}$, Remark 3.4 shows that $\varphi(o) = \varphi(o+\lambda_E)$ for all affine K-roots φ. That is, $\lambda_E \in \mathbf{X}_*^K(Z(\mathbf{H})) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$. Since i_K and i'_K are $\mathrm{Aut}(K/F)$-equivariant, $\lambda_E \in (\mathbf{X}_*^K(Z(\mathbf{H})) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R})^{\mathrm{Aut}(K/F)} = \mathbf{X}_*^F(Z(\mathbf{H})) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$. Since i_K and i'_K are $\mathbf{H}(K)$-equivariant, $i_K(x+\lambda_E) = i'_K(x)$ for $x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}, K)$, so $i_E(x+\lambda_E) = i'_E(x)$ for $x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}, E)$. For $x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}, F)$, we have that $\lambda_F = i_F(x) - i'_F(x) = i_E(x) - i'_E(x) = \lambda_E$. Thus, λ_E does not depend on E. ☐

Corollary 4.8. *Let* $\mathbf{D}$ *be a subvariety, defined over* F*, of an* F^{tr}*-split modulo center torus in* $\mathbf{G}$*, and put* $\mathbf{H} = C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{D})$*. Then* $\mathbf{H}$ *and* $\mathbf{H}^\circ$ *are compatibly filtered* F*-subgroups of* $\mathbf{G}$*.*

Proof. By Corollary 9.2 of [7], $\mathbf{H}$ (hence also $\mathbf{H}^\circ$) is defined over F. Clearly, $\mathbf{H}^\circ$ and $\mathbf{G}$ have the same absolute rank. By Lemma A.1, they also have the same F^{tr}-split rank. Thus $\mathbf{H}^\circ$ satisfies the conditions of Proposition 4.6, so that $\mathbf{H}^\circ$ is a compatibly filtered F-subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$. Now it suffices to show that, for a discretely valued separable extension E/F, a point $x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}, E)$, and $r \in \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{>0}$, we have that $\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,r} \cap \mathbf{H}(E) \subseteq \mathbf{H}^\circ(E)$. By Lemma 3.7, enlarging E only makes this statement stronger, so we will do so as necessary.

First, we may, and hence do, assume that $\mathbf{H}$ is E-split. If $x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}, E)$, then let $\mathbf{T}$ be an E-split maximal torus in $\mathbf{H}$ such that $x \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{T})$. Then $\mathbf{T}$ contains $Z(\mathbf{H}^\circ)$, hence, in particular, contains $\mathbf{D}$. By [45, §II.4.1(a)], the component group of $\mathbf{H}$ has a set of representatives in $N_{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{T})(E)$. Suppose that $h \in N_{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{T})(E)$ is such that $\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,r} \cap h\mathbf{H}^\circ(E) \neq \emptyset$. Let $\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{H}}$ be a Borel E-subgroup of $\mathbf{H}^\circ$ containing $\mathbf{T}$. Then ${}^h\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{H}}$ contains ${}^h\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{T}$, so there is some $n \in N_{\mathbf{H}^\circ}(\mathbf{T})(E)$ such that ${}^h\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{H}} = {}^n\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{H}}$. We have that $n^{-1}h \in N_{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{T})$ and $(n^{-1}h)\mathbf{H}^\circ = h\mathbf{H}^\circ$; so, upon replacing h by $n^{-1}h$, we may, and hence do, assume that ${}^h\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{H}} = \mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{H}}$.

Now let $\mathbf{B}$ be a Borel E-subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$ containing $\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{H}}$, say with opposite Borel $\mathbf{B}'$ (with respect to $\mathbf{T}$). By Remark 3.4, $\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,r} \subseteq \mathbf{B}(E)\mathbf{B}'(E)$.

Thus $\mathbf{B}(E)\mathbf{B}'(E) \cap h\mathbf{H}^\circ(E) \neq \emptyset$; hence, *a fortiori*, $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}' \cap h\mathbf{H}^\circ \neq \emptyset$. Since $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}' \cap h\mathbf{H}^\circ$ is a non-empty Zariski open subset of $h\mathbf{H}^\circ$, it intersects any other such subset; in particular, $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}' \cap h\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{H}}\mathbf{B}'_{\mathbf{H}} \neq \emptyset$, where $\mathbf{B}'_{\mathbf{H}}$ is the opposite Borel to $\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{H}}$ (with respect to $\mathbf{T}$). Since h normalizes $\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{H}}$, it follows that $\mathbf{B}h\mathbf{B}' = \mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}'$. Now let n_0 be a representative in $N_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{T})$ of the long element of the Weyl group of $\mathbf{G}$. Then $\mathbf{B}' = n_0\mathbf{B}n_0^{-1}$, so $\mathbf{B}hn_0\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{B}n_0\mathbf{B}$. By the Bruhat decomposition, this means that hn_0 and n_0 project to the same element of the Weyl group of $\mathbf{G}$; i.e., $h \in \mathbf{T}(E)$. In particular, $h \in \mathbf{H}^\circ(E)$. That is, the only connected component of $\mathbf{H}$ intersecting $\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,r}$ is the identity component, as desired. □

Remark 4.9. There are other situations where a subgroup $\mathbf{H}$ of a group $\mathbf{G}$ is compatibly filtered. (For example, consider the case where $\operatorname{char}\mathfrak{f} \neq 2$, and $\mathbf{H}$ is a classical group embedded in a general linear group $\mathbf{G}$ in the usual way.) However, we will not need this fact.

Lemma 4.10. *Suppose that* $\mathbf{M}$ *is an* F^{tr}*-Levi* F*-subgroup of* $\mathbf{G}$*, and* $\mathbf{H}$ *is a compatibly filtered* F*-subgroup of* $\mathbf{G}$ *containing the maximal* F^{tr}*-split torus in the center of* $\mathbf{M}$*. Then* $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{M}, E) \cap \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}, F) = \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{M} \cap \mathbf{H}, F)$ *for any discretely valued separable extension* E/F*.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{S}$ be the maximal F^{tr}-split torus in the center of $\mathbf{M}$, so that $\mathbf{M} = C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S})$. We may, and hence do, replace F by the splitting field of $\mathbf{S}$. Fix a discretely valued separable extension E/F.

Now $\mathbf{M}$ is an F-Levi subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$, and $\mathbf{M} \cap \mathbf{H} = C_{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{S})$ is an F-Levi subgroup of $\mathbf{H}$. Since S_{b} is a sufficiently large subgroup of both S_{b} and $\mathbf{S}(E)_{\mathrm{b}}$, in the sense of [32, §1.3], Proposition 1.3 of loc. cit. gives that

$$\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{M}, E) \cap \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}, F) = \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, E)^{S_{\mathrm{b}}} \cap \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}, F) = \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}, F)^{S_{\mathrm{b}}} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{M} \cap \mathbf{H}, F),$$

as desired. □

Because we will need it for the next result, we reproduce here the definitions (Definition 2.15) of absolute semisimplicity and topological unipotence from [43] (where they are called absolute F-semisimplicity and topological F-unipotence). The notations F' and $\mathcal{F}(F)$ introduced in the definition are used *only* to define absolute semisimplicity. The group $\mathcal{F}(F)$ is discussed in much more detail in §2.3 of loc. cit.

Definition 4.11. Let F' be a complete subfield of F such that F/F' is unramified. If $\operatorname{char}\mathfrak{f} = 0$, then choose a $\operatorname{Gal}(F'^{\mathrm{un}}/F')$-stable subfield of F'^{un} which is mapped by the natural projection isomorphically to $\bar{\mathfrak{f}}$, and write $\mathcal{F}(F)$ for the multiplicative group of this subfield. If $\operatorname{char}\mathfrak{f} = p > 0$, then put $\mathcal{F}(F) = \bigcup_{L/F' \text{ finite unramified}} \bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} (L^\times)^{p^n}$. In either case, an element $\gamma \in G$ is *absolutely semisimple* if and only if it is semisimple, and its character values (in the sense of Definition A.4) lie in $\mathcal{F}(F)$.

Proposition 4.12. *Suppose $g \in G$ is absolutely semisimple (in the sense of Definition 4.11). Then*

$$\mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}}(g), F) = \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F)^g.$$

This result also appears as Proposition 2.33 in [43], with a somewhat different proof. Note that, when F is an algebraic extension of a locally compact field, g has finite order coprime to $\operatorname{char} \mathfrak{f}$, so the result is just Theorem 1.9 of [32].

Proof. By Proposition 5.1.1 of [35], it suffices to prove this result over some tame extension of F. By Corollary 2.37 of [43], g is tame. Thus we may, and hence do, assume that g belongs to some F-split torus. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the (cyclic) group generated by g, and $\mathbf{S}$ its Zariski closure in $\mathbf{G}$.

We prove the result first in case no character value of g (in the sense of Definition A.4) projects to a non-trivial root of unity in $\mathfrak{f}$. By Lemma A.9, in this case, $\mathbf{S}$ is a torus. By Proposition 1.3 of [32], the result will follow in this case once we know that $\mathcal{F}$ is a sufficiently large subgroup of S_{b} (in the sense of §1.3 of loc. cit.).

Trivially, $C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathcal{F}) = C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S})$. Now suppose that $\mathbf{T}$ is a maximal F-split torus containing $\mathbf{S}$, and x a point of $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{T})$. Denote by T_x the $\mathfrak{f}$-split torus in G_x° corresponding to $\mathbf{T}$ (so that $\mathsf{T}_x(\mathfrak{f})$ is the image in $\mathsf{G}_x^\circ(\mathfrak{f})$ of T_{b}), and by g the image of g in G_x°. Put $\mathbf{Y} = \bigl\{\chi \in \mathbf{X}^*(\mathbf{T}) \bigm| \chi(g) = 1\bigr\}$ and $\mathsf{Y} = \bigl\{\chi \in \mathbf{X}^*(\mathsf{T}_x) \bigm| \chi(\mathsf{g}) = 1\bigr\}$, and let S_x be the Zariski closure of the group generated by g. By Proposition 8.2(c) of [7], $\mathbf{S} = \bigcap_{\chi \in \mathbf{Y}} \ker \chi$ and $\mathsf{S}_x = \bigcap_{\chi \in \mathsf{Y}} \ker \chi$. Since $\mathbf{T}$ is F-split, there is an identification i of the cocharacter lattices of $\mathbf{T}$ and T_x such that the square

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathbf{X}_*(\mathbf{T}) \times F_0^\times \arrow[r, "\text{eval}"] \arrow[d, "i \times \text{proj}"'] & T_{\mathrm{b}} \arrow[d, "\text{proj}"'] \\
\mathbf{X}_*(\mathsf{T}_x) \times \mathfrak{f}^\times \arrow[r, "\text{eval}"] & \mathsf{T}_x(\mathfrak{f})
\end{tikzcd}$$

commutes. By duality, we deduce an identification $i^* : \mathbf{X}^*(\mathbf{T}) \cong \mathbf{X}^*(\mathsf{T}_x)$ which commutes with evaluation, in the natural sense. In particular, no character value of g is a non-trivial root of unity. Since $\mathcal{F}(F) \cap F_{0+}^\times = \{1\}$ (in the notation of Definition 4.11), we have that $i^*(\mathbf{Y}) = \mathsf{Y}$. By another application of Lemma A.9, S_x is a torus (necessarily $\mathfrak{f}$-split), hence is generated by the images of those cocharacters $\lambda \in \mathbf{X}_*(\mathsf{T}_x)$ such that $\lambda \circ \chi = 1$ for $\chi \in \mathsf{Y}$. Such a cocharacter may be lifted (via i) to a cocharacter (again called λ) of $\mathbf{T}$ such that $\lambda \circ \chi = 1$ for $\chi \in \mathbf{Y}$; i.e., to a cocharacter of $\mathbf{S}$. Thus $\mathsf{S}_x(\mathfrak{f})$ is the image of S_{b}. In particular, the "centralizer modulo $\mathfrak{p}$" of S_{b} is $C_{\mathsf{G}_x^\circ}(\mathsf{S}_x) = C_{\mathsf{G}_x^\circ}(\mathsf{g})$, which is equal to the "centralizer modulo $\mathfrak{p}$" of $\mathcal{F}$. This is precisely the definition of a sufficiently large subgroup.

Now it remains to handle the general case. Pick any pair $(\mathbf{T}, x)$ as above, and preserve the above notation. By Lemma A.8, there exists an integer n, not divisible by $\operatorname{char} \mathfrak{f}$, such that g^n has no non-trivial roots of unity as character values. Since the character values of g^n are the projections to $\mathfrak{f}^\times$ of those of g^n, we have that any root of unity arising as a character value of g^n must belong to $\mathcal{F}(F) \cap F_{0+}^\times = \{1\}$. Thus, by what we have already shown, $\mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}}(g^n), F) = \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F)^{g^n}$. By Theorem 1.9 of [32], $\mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}}(g), F) = \mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}}(g^n), F)^g$. We are finished. $\square$

5. GROUPS ASSOCIATED TO CONCAVE FUNCTIONS

5.1. Basic definitions.

Definition 5.1. Call a sequence $\vec{\mathbf{G}} = (\mathbf{G}^0 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq \mathbf{G}^d)$ of connected reductive F-groups a *tame reductive F-sequence* if all $\mathbf{G}^i$ have the same absolute and F^{tr}-ranks. We write $\operatorname{Lie}(\vec{\mathbf{G}}) = (\operatorname{Lie}(\mathbf{G}^0), \ldots, \operatorname{Lie}(\mathbf{G}^d))$. A *splitting field* for $\vec{\mathbf{G}}$ is any field over which all $\mathbf{G}^i$ for $0 \leq i \leq d$ are split.

Remark 5.2. By Proposition 4.6, if $\vec{\mathbf{G}} = (\mathbf{G}^0 \subseteq \ldots \subseteq \mathbf{G}^d)$ is a tame reductive F-sequence, then, for all $0 \leq i \leq j \leq d$, $\mathbf{G}^i$ is a compatibly filtered F-subgroup of $\mathbf{G}^j$. We will always choose our embeddings of buildings in such a way that, for all discretely valued extensions E/F and all $0 \leq i \leq j \leq k \leq d$, the composition $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}^i, E) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}^j, E) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}^k, E)$ is the same as the embedding $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}^i, E) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}^k, E)$.

Definition 5.3. Call a sequence $\vec{\mathbf{G}} = (\mathbf{G}^0 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq \mathbf{G}^d)$ of connected reductive F-groups a *tame Levi F-sequence* if there is a tame extension L/F such that each $\mathbf{G}^i$ is an L-Levi subgroup of $\mathbf{G}^d$.

Remark 5.4. Note that Definition 5.3 is usually more general than the analogous definition in [48]. If $\mathbf{G}^d$ is tame, then these definitions coincide.

It is clear from the definitions that every tame Levi F-sequence is a tame reductive F-sequence. Moreover, any subsequence of a tame reductive (respectively, tame Levi) F-sequence is also a tame reductive (respectively, tame Levi) F-sequence.

Definition 5.5. Suppose that $\mathbf{T}$ is a maximal torus in $\mathbf{G}$ and $x \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{T})$. Say that F is *sufficiently large* (for $\mathbf{T}$ and x) if $\mathbf{T}$ is F-split, F is strictly Henselian, and, whenever $\psi \in \widetilde{\Psi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$ satisfies $\psi(x) \in \mathbb{Q} \cdot \operatorname{ord}(F^\times)$ and ${}_F U_\psi \neq {}_F U_{\psi+}$, then actually $\psi(x) \in \operatorname{ord}(F^\times)$.

Remark 5.6. Suppose that F is sufficiently large and E/F is a discretely valued algebraic extension. If ψ is an affine E-root satisfying $\psi(x) \in \mathbb{Q} \cdot \operatorname{ord}(E^\times) = \mathbb{Q} \cdot \operatorname{ord}(F^\times)$ and ${}_E U_\psi \neq {}_E U_{\psi+}$, choose an affine F-root ψ_0

satisfying $\dot\psi_0 = \dot\psi$ and ${}_FU_{\psi_0} \neq {}_FU_{\psi_0+}$. An easy calculation, using the definition of the affine root groups ${}_FU_\psi$ and ${}_FU_{\psi_0}$ (as in [46, §1.4], or the proof of Proposition 4.6), shows that the value of the constant function $\psi - \psi_0$ lies in $\operatorname{ord}(E^\times) \subseteq \mathbb{Q} \cdot \operatorname{ord}(F^\times)$, so $\psi_0(x) \in \mathbb{Q} \cdot \operatorname{ord}(F^\times)$. Since F is sufficiently large, $\psi_0(x) \in \operatorname{ord}(F^\times)$, so $\psi(x) \in \operatorname{ord}(E^\times)$. That is, E is also sufficiently large.

If $\psi(x) \in \operatorname{ord}(F^\times)$, then, since $\psi_0(x) \in \operatorname{ord}(F^\times)$, the value of the constant function $\psi - \psi_0$ lies in $\operatorname{ord}(F^\times)$. Since ${}_FU_{\psi_0} \neq {}_FU_{\psi_0+}$, another computation as above shows that ${}_FU_\psi \neq {}_FU_{\psi+}$.

The following definition appears in [12, §6.4.3].

Definition 5.7. For any root system Φ, a function $f : \Phi \cup \{0\} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}$ is called *concave* if, for any finite non-empty sequence $(\alpha_i)_i$ in $\Phi \cup \{0\}$ with $\sum_i \alpha_i \in \Phi \cup \{0\}$, we have

$$f\Bigl(\sum_i \alpha_i\Bigr) \leq \sum_i f(\alpha_i).$$

Note that, if f is concave, then $f(0) \geq 0$.

Definition 5.8. A sequence $\vec r = (r_0, \dots, r_d)$ of elements of $\widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{\geq 0}$ is *admissible* if $2r_j \geq r_i$ for all $0 \leq i \leq j \leq d$. (Note that this is more general than the definition given in [48].) If $\vec r$ is admissible and $\vec{\mathbf{G}} = (\mathbf{G}^0, \dots, \mathbf{G}^d)$ is a tame reductive F-sequence, then denote by $f_{\vec{\mathbf{G}},\vec r}$ the function on $\widetilde\Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$ which is equal to r_i on $\Phi(\mathbf{G}^i, \mathbf{T}) \smallsetminus \Phi(\mathbf{G}^{i-1}, \mathbf{T})$ for $0 < i \leq d$, and to r_0 on $\widetilde\Phi(\mathbf{G}^0, \mathbf{T})$. (Here, $\mathbf{T}$ is any maximal F-torus in $\mathbf{G}^0$. We will see in Lemma 5.20 that the choice of $\mathbf{T}$ is immaterial.)

The next result is the analogue of Lemma 1.2 of [48].

Lemma 5.9. *If $\vec r$ is admissible and $\vec{\mathbf{G}}$ is a tame reductive F-sequence, then the function $f_{\vec{\mathbf{G}},\vec r}$ is concave.*

Proof. Write $\vec r = (r_0, \dots, r_d)$ and $\vec{\mathbf{G}} = (\mathbf{G}^0, \dots, \mathbf{G}^d)$. Let $\mathbf{T}$ be a maximal torus in $\mathbf{G}^0$. By Lemma 1.1 of [48], it will be enough to show that $f_{\vec{\mathbf{G}},\vec r}(\alpha + \beta) \leq f_{\vec{\mathbf{G}},\vec r}(\alpha) + f_{\vec{\mathbf{G}},\vec r}(\beta)$ whenever $\alpha, \beta, \alpha + \beta \in \widetilde\Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$. Fix α and β as above, and let $0 \leq i \leq d$ and $0 \leq j \leq d$ be the smallest indices such that $\alpha \in \widetilde\Phi(\mathbf{G}^i, \mathbf{T})$ and $\beta \in \widetilde\Phi(\mathbf{G}^j, \mathbf{T})$. If $i \neq j$, then, assuming, as we may without loss of generality, that $i < j$, we have $f_{\vec{\mathbf{G}},\vec r}(\alpha + \beta) = r_j \leq r_i + r_j = f_{\vec{\mathbf{G}},\vec r}(\alpha) + f_{\vec{\mathbf{G}},\vec r}(\beta)$. If $i = j$, then let $0 \leq k \leq d$ be the smallest index such that $\alpha + \beta \in \widetilde\Phi(\mathbf{G}^k, \mathbf{T})$. Since $k \leq i$, Definition 5.8 implies that $f_{\vec{\mathbf{G}},\vec r}(\alpha + \beta) = r_k \leq 2r_i = f_{\vec{\mathbf{G}},\vec r}(\alpha) + f_{\vec{\mathbf{G}},\vec r}(\beta)$. □

Definition 5.10. Suppose that $f : \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T}) \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}$ is any function and $x \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{T})$ (where $\mathbf{T}$ is a maximal torus in $\mathbf{G}$). Say that $x' \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{T})$ is an (x, f)-*positive point* (respectively, *strictly* (x, f)-*positive point*) if $\psi(x') \geq 0$ (respectively, $\psi(x') > 0$) whenever ψ is an affine root and $\psi(x) = f(\dot{\psi})$. If $y \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{T})$ and $h : \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T}) \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{\geq 0}$ is a concave function, say that (y, h) is an (x, f)-*positive pair* if $h(\dot{\psi}) + \psi(x) = f(\dot{\psi}) + \psi(y)$ for every affine root ψ.

Notice that, if $f_1 \leq f_2$, then an (x, f_1)-positive point is also an (x, f_2)-positive point.

For the rest of this subsection, fix a function $f : \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T}) \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}$ and a point $x \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{T})$ (where $\mathbf{T}$ is a maximal F-torus in $\mathbf{G}$).

Lemma 5.11. *If (y, h) is an (x, f)-positive pair, then y is an (x, f)-positive point.*

Proof. Suppose that ψ is an affine root with $\psi(x) = f(\dot{\psi})$. If $f(\dot{\psi}) = \infty$, then $\psi(x) = \infty$, so ψ is the constant function ∞. In particular, $\psi(y) = \infty$. Otherwise, let $r \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $\psi(x) = f(\dot{\psi}) \in \{r, r+\}$. Then $(h(\dot{\psi}) + r)+ = (r + \psi(y))+$. Let $s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$ be such that $h(\dot{\psi}) \in \{s, s+\}$. Then $(s + r)+ = (r + \psi(y))+$, so $s + r \leq r + \psi(y)$, so $s \leq \psi(y)$. Since $s \geq 0$, we are done. □

Lemma 5.12. *Put $\Gamma_{(x,f)} := \operatorname{stab}_{\operatorname{Gal}(F^{\mathrm{sep}}/F)}(x, f)$. If f is concave, then there exists a $\Gamma_{(x,f)}$-fixed (x, f)-positive pair (y, h). If f takes values in $\mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ and $f(0) > 0$, then y may be taken to be strictly (x, f)-positive. If $\Gamma_{(x,f)} = \operatorname{Gal}(F^{\mathrm{sep}}/F)$, then $y \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T}, F)$.*

Recall that $\mathbf{T}$ is a compatibly filtered subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$, and that we may thus identify $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T}, F)$ with a particular subset of $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F)$. The final assertion of the lemma is that y belongs to this particular subset.

Proof. By Proposition 6.4.6 of [12], there is a linear form λ on $\mathbf{X}^*(\mathbf{T}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$ such that $(f + \lambda)(\alpha) \geq 0$ (or $(f + \lambda)(\alpha) > 0$, if f takes values in $\mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ and $f(0) > 0$) for all $\alpha \in \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$. Certainly, $(f + \lambda)(0) = f(0) \geq 0$ (respectively, $(f + \lambda)(0) = f(0) > 0$) as well. Put $\tilde{h} = f + \lambda$. We may also regard λ as an element of $\mathbf{X}_*(\mathbf{T}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$. Then put $\tilde{y} = x + \lambda$. Clearly, $(\tilde{y}, \tilde{h})$ is an (x, f)-positive pair; and $\tilde{y}$ is strictly (x, f)-positive if f takes values in $\mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ and $f(0) > 0$.

Since x and f are $\Gamma_{(x,f)}$-fixed, we have that

$$(\tilde{h} \circ \sigma)(\dot{\psi}) + \psi(x) = (\tilde{h} \circ \sigma)(\dot{\psi}) + \psi(\sigma x) = (f \circ \sigma)(\dot{\psi}) + \psi(\sigma \tilde{y}) = f(\dot{\psi}) + \psi(\sigma \tilde{y})$$

for all affine roots ψ and all $\sigma \in \Gamma_{(x,f)}$. Thus, if we let y be the center of mass of the $\Gamma_{(x,f)}$-orbit of $\tilde{y}$, and h be the average of the compositions $\tilde{h} \circ \sigma$

as σ ranges over $\Gamma_{(f,x)}$, then we have that $h(\dot{\psi})+\psi(x) = f(\dot{\psi})+\psi(y)$ for all affine roots ψ. Since h evidently takes values in $\widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{\geq 0}$, we have that (y,h) is a $\Gamma_{(x,f)}$-invariant (x,f)-positive pair. Further, if $\tilde{y}$ is strictly (x,f)-positive, then so is y.

Suppose that $\Gamma_{(x,f)} = \operatorname{Gal}(F^{\mathrm{sep}}/F)$. Let L/F be a discretely valued tame extension such that the maximal F^{tr}-split subtorus $\mathbf{S}^\sharp$ of $\mathbf{T}$ is L-split. By Proposition 4.6, $\mathbf{T}$ is a compatibly filtered L-subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$ (in fact, it is an L-Levi subgroup); that is, there is a system of embeddings $(i_E : \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T},E) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G},E))_{E/F}$ as in Definition 4.3. Let E be the splitting field of $\mathbf{T}$ over L. Then the map $i_E : \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T},E) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G},E)$ is $\operatorname{Gal}(E/L)$-equivariant and restricts to the map $i_L : \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T},L) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G},L) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G},E)$. In particular, the image in $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G},E)$ of $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T},L)$ is contained in that of $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T},E)^{\operatorname{Gal}(E/L)} = \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{T})^{\operatorname{Gal}(E/L)}$. Of course, $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T},L) = \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S}^\sharp)$ is an affine space under $\mathbf{X}_*(\mathbf{S}^\sharp) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$. By [46, §1.10], so is $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{T})^{\operatorname{Gal}(E/L)}$. Thus $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{T})^{\operatorname{Gal}(E/L)} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T},L)$. Since y is $\Gamma_{(x,f)}$-fixed, hence $\operatorname{Gal}(E/L)$-fixed, we have that $y \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S}^\sharp) = \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T},L)$. Since y is, further, $\operatorname{Gal}(L/F)$-fixed, we have that $y \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T},L)^{\operatorname{Gal}(L/F)} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T},F)$. □

5.2. **Groups associated to concave functions.** Fix, for the remainder of this section,

- a tame reductive F-sequence $(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{G}^0, \cdots, \mathbf{G}^d = \mathbf{G})$ with $\mathbf{T}$ a torus,
- a point x lying in the image of $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T},F)$ in $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G},F)$,
- a $\operatorname{Gal}(F^{\mathrm{sep}}/F)$-invariant concave function $f : \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{T}) \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}$, and
- a $\operatorname{Gal}(F^{\mathrm{sep}}/F)$-invariant (x,f)-positive pair (y,h) with $y \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T},F)$.

By Lemma 5.12, a pair (y,h) as above exists. Put $\vec{\mathbf{G}} = (\mathbf{G}^0, \ldots, \mathbf{G}^d)$.

Definition 5.13. Suppose that F is sufficiently large for $\mathbf{T}$ and y. Put

$$_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f} := \langle U_\psi : \psi \in \widetilde{\Psi}(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{T}) \text{ and } \psi(x) \geq f(\dot{\psi})\rangle.$$

If $f = f_{\vec{\mathbf{G}},\vec{r}}$ for an admissible sequence $\vec{r} = (r_0, \ldots, r_d)$, put

$$\vec{G}_{x,\vec{r}} := {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f}\,.$$

Note that the definition still makes sense if we only assume that $\mathbf{T}$ is F-split (rather than that F is sufficiently large), but then it might not agree with Definition 5.14 below when $f(0) = 0$. Note further that, as in [48, §1], $\vec{G}_{x,\vec{r}}$ is just an open subgroup of G, not a sequence of such subgroups.

Fix, for the remainder of this section, a discretely valued Galois extension E/F such that E is sufficiently large for $\mathbf{T}$ and y.

Definition 5.14. Put ${}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f} := {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,f} \cap G_0$. For an admissible sequence $\vec{r}$, put $\vec{G}_{x,\vec{r}} := \vec{\mathbf{G}}(E)_{x,\vec{r}} \cap G_0$. We will sometimes write $(G^0, \ldots, G^d)_{x,\vec{r}}$

instead of $\vec{G}_{x,\vec{r}}$. If $\mathbf{H}$ is a compatibly filtered F-subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$ containing $\mathbf{T}$, then we will use ${}_{\mathbf{T}}H_{x,f}$ as shorthand for ${}_{\mathbf{T}}H_{x,g}$, where $g = f\big|_{\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{H},\mathbf{T})}$.

Note that ${}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f} = {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{y,h}$.

We will show (see Lemma 5.28) that ${}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f}$ does not depend on the choice of sufficiently large extension E; and (see Lemma 5.20) that, if $\vec{r}$ is admissible, then $\vec{G}_{x,\vec{r}}$ is independent of the choice of $\mathbf{T}$ (see Lemma 5.20). For example, under Hypothesis (A), if $\vec{r} = (r, r, \dots, r)$, then $\vec{G}_{x,\vec{r}} = G_{x,r}$ (see Remark 5.31).

Remark 5.15. We have defined $\vec{G}_{x,\vec{r}}$ when $\vec{\mathbf{G}}$ is indexed by a finite set. For later purposes, it will be convenient to handle the case where $\vec{\mathbf{G}} = (\mathbf{G}^i)_{i\in I}$ and $\vec{r} = (r_i)_{i\in I}$ are indexed by any totally ordered set I (such as an interval). Suppose that $I \neq \emptyset$. Since $\mathbf{G}^i \mapsto \Phi(\mathbf{G}^i, \mathbf{T})$ is an injection from the set of groups in $\vec{\mathbf{G}}$ to the set of subsets of $\Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$, there are actually only finitely many distinct groups appearing in $\vec{\mathbf{G}}$. Denote these finitely many groups by $\vec{\mathbf{H}} = (\mathbf{H}^0 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq \mathbf{H}^d)$, and put $\vec{s} = (s_0, \dots, s_d)$, where $s_j = \inf\left\{ r_i \,\middle|\, \mathbf{G}^i = \mathbf{H}^j \right\}$ for $0 \le j \le d$. (Here, the infimum is taken in $\widetilde{\mathbb{R}}$, not $\mathbb{R}$. Thus, for example, the infima of the intervals $(0, 1)$ and $(0+, 1)$ are both $0+$, not 0.) Then we define $\vec{G}_{x,\vec{r}} := \vec{H}_{x,\vec{s}}$. If $I = \emptyset$, put $\vec{G}_{x,\vec{r}} := \{1\}$.

Lemma 5.16. *If $x' \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T}, F)$ is an (x, f)-positive point, then, for any subextension L/F of E/F, we have ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f} = {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,f} \cap \mathbf{G}(L)_{x',0}$.*

Proof. Fix x' and L/F as in the statement of the lemma. Then clearly ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,f}$ fixes x', and $x' \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T}, L)$. By Lemma 3.11, we have ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f} = {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,f} \cap \mathbf{G}(L)_0 \subseteq {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,f} \cap \mathbf{G}(L)_{x',0}$. The reverse containment being obvious, we have equality. ☐

Lemma 5.17. *Let $f_j : \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T}) \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}$ be a $\operatorname{Gal}(E/F)$-invariant, concave function for $j = 1, 2$. Let $f_1 \vee f_2$ be as in Definition B.1. Suppose that*

- *$(f_1 \vee f_2)(0) \neq -\infty$ and*
- *there is some point $x' \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T}, F)$ which is both (x, f_1)- and (x, f_2)-positive.*

(For example, this occurs when f_1 and f_2 are both non-negative, or $f_1 \le f_2$.) Then $[{}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f_1}, {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f_2}]$ is contained in ${}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f_1\vee f_2}$.

Proof. Since $(f_1 \vee f_2)(0) \neq -\infty$, Proposition 6.4.44 of [12] shows that $f_1 \vee f_2$ is concave and

$$[{}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,f_1}, {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,f_2}] \subseteq {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,f_1\vee f_2}.$$

(The cited proposition depends on condition (Pr) of [12], which, by Proposition 6.4.39 of loc. cit., is equivalent to the existence of a “prolongation of root datum”, in the sense of §6.4.38 of loc. cit. By Lemma 6.1 of [49], such a prolongation exists.) If further there exists a point x' as in the statement of the lemma, then, by Lemma 5.16,

$$[{}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f_1}, {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f_2}] \subseteq {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,f_1 \vee f_2} \cap G_{x',0} \subseteq {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f_1 \vee f_2}\,. \qquad \square$$

Corollary 5.18. *Suppose that* $\vec{s}^{(j)} = (s_0^{(j)}, \dots, s_d^{(j)})$ *are admissible sequences for* $j = 1, 2$. *Put* $t^{(j)} = \min\left\{s_0^{(j)}, \dots, s_d^{(j)}\right\}$ *for* $j = 1, 2$,

$$r_0 = \min\left\{\, s_k^{(1)} + s_k^{(2)} \mid 0 \le k \le d\right\},$$

and

$$r_i = \min\left\{\, s_i^{(1)} + t^{(2)}, t^{(1)} + s_i^{(2)}, s_k^{(1)} + s_k^{(2)} \mid i < k \le d\right\}$$

for all $0 < i \le d$. *Then* $[\vec{G}_{x,\vec{s}^{(1)}}, \vec{G}_{x,\vec{s}^{(2)}}] \subseteq \vec{G}_{x,\vec{r}}$.

Proof. Note that $\vec{r}$ is admissible. Put $f_j = f_{\vec{\mathbf{G}},\vec{s}^{(j)}}$ for $j = 1, 2$, and $f = f_{\vec{\mathbf{G}},\vec{r}}$. (See Definition 5.13.) For notational convenience, put $\Phi^0 = \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}^0, \mathbf{T})$, and $\Phi^i = \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}^i, \mathbf{T}) \smallsetminus \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}^{i-1}, \mathbf{T})$ for $0 < i \le d$. Note that $0 \in \Phi^0$. Fix $0 \le i \le d$ and $\alpha \in \Phi^i$. Write, in any fashion whatsoever, $\alpha = \sum a_m + \sum b_n$, where $(a_m)_m$ and $(b_n)_n$ are finite non-empty sequences in $\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$.

First suppose that $i = 0$. Let k be the greatest index for which some a_m or b_n is in Φ^k. If there are $a_m, b_n \in \Phi^k$ (in particular, if $k = 0$), then

$$\sum_m f_1(a_m) + \sum_n f_2(b_n) \ge s_k^{(1)} + s_k^{(2)} \ge f(\alpha).$$

Otherwise, $k > 0$ and there are distinct indices $m \ne m'$, or $n \ne n'$, such that $a_m, a_{m'} \in \Phi^k$, or $b_n, b_{n'} \in \Phi^k$. In the former case, let $0 \le j < k$ be such that some b_n is in Φ^j. Then

$$\sum_m f_1(a_m) + \sum_n f_2(b_n) \ge 2s_k^{(1)} + s_j^{(2)} \ge s_j^{(1)} + s_j^{(2)} \ge f(\alpha).$$

The latter case is handled similarly. Thus $(f_1 \vee f_2)(\alpha) \ge f(\alpha)$. (Here, $\vee$ is as in Definition B.1.)

Now suppose that $i > 0$. Note that some a_m or b_n must lie in Φ^k for some $k \ge i$. If some $a_m \in \Phi^i$, then

$$\sum_m f_1(a_m) + \sum_n f_2(b_n) \ge s_i^{(1)} + t^{(2)} \ge f(\alpha).$$

If some $b_n \in \Phi^i$, then similarly

$$\sum_m f_1(a_m) + \sum_n f_2(b_n) \ge f(\alpha).$$

If, for some $k > i$, there are $a_m, a_{m'} \in \Phi^k$ with $m \neq m'$, then

$$\sum_m f_1(a_m) + \sum_n f_2(b_n) \geq 2s_k^{(1)} + t^{(2)} \geq s_i^{(1)} + t^{(2)} \geq f(\alpha).$$

If, for some $k > i$, there are $b_n, b_{n'} \in \Phi^k$ with $n \neq n'$, then similarly

$$\sum_m f_1(a_m) + \sum_n f_2(b_n) \geq f(\alpha).$$

If there are $a_m, b_n \in \Phi^k$ for some $k > i$, then

$$\sum_m f_1(a_m) + \sum_n f_2(b_n) \geq s_k^{(1)} + s_k^{(2)} \geq f(\alpha).$$

Thus $(f_1 \vee f_2)(\alpha) \geq f(\alpha)$.

Since $\alpha \in \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$ was arbitrary, the result follows from Lemma 5.17. $\square$

Recall that the construction of $\vec{G}_{x,\vec{r}}$ depended on a torus $\mathbf{T}$, which we suppressed from the notation. We will temporarily indicate the dependence on $\mathbf{T}$ by writing ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\vec{G}_{x,\vec{r}}$.

Lemma 5.19. *For any admissible sequence $\vec{r}$ and $g \in G^0 \cap \operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x})$, ${}^g({}_{\mathbf{T}}\vec{G}_{x,\vec{r}}) = {}_{{}^g\mathbf{T}}\vec{G}_{x,\vec{r}}$.*

Proof. The action of g induces bijections from $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{T})$ to $\mathcal{A}({}^g\mathbf{T})$ and $\widetilde{\Psi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$ to $\widetilde{\Psi}(\mathbf{G}, {}^g\mathbf{T})$ such that, if $y \mapsto y'$ and $\psi \mapsto \psi'$, then ${}^gU_\psi = U_{\psi'}$ and $\psi(y) = \psi'(y')$. Since ψ and ψ' depend only on the images of their arguments in $\mathcal{B}^{\text{red}}(\mathbf{G}, F)$, and since x and gx have the same image there, we have in particular that $\psi(x) = \psi'(x)$. Similarly, the action of g induces a bijection from $\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$ to $\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}, {}^g\mathbf{T})$ such that $\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}^0, \mathbf{T})$ is carried to $\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}^0, {}^g\mathbf{T})$, and $\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}^i, \mathbf{T}) \smallsetminus \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}^{i-1}, \mathbf{T})$ is carried to $\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}^i, {}^g\mathbf{T}) \smallsetminus \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}^{i-1}, {}^g\mathbf{T})$ for each $0 < i \leq d$. Thus ${}^g({}_{\mathbf{T}}\vec{\mathbf{G}}(E)_{x,\vec{r}}) = {}_{{}^g\mathbf{T}}\vec{\mathbf{G}}(E)_{x,\vec{r}}$. Since ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\vec{G}_{x,\vec{r}} = {}_{\mathbf{T}}\vec{\mathbf{G}}(E)_{x,\vec{r}} \cap G_0$, and similarly for ${}_{{}^g\mathbf{T}}\vec{G}_{x,\vec{r}}$, and since conjugation by g preserves G_0, we have the desired equality. $\square$

Lemma 5.20. *Suppose that $\vec{r}$ is admissible, and $\mathbf{T}_j$ is an E-split F-torus such that $(\mathbf{T}_j, \mathbf{G}^0)$ is a tame reductive sequence and $x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T}_j, F)$ for $j = 1, 2$. Then ${}_{\mathbf{T}_1}\vec{G}_{x,\vec{r}} = {}_{\mathbf{T}_2}\vec{G}_{x,\vec{r}}$.*

Proof. By Proposition 4.6.28(iii) of [13], there is $g \in \mathbf{G}^0(E)_{x,0}$ such that ${}^g\mathbf{T}_1 = \mathbf{T}_2$. By Lemma 5.19, ${}^g({}_{\mathbf{T}_1}\vec{\mathbf{G}}(E)_{x,\vec{r}}) = {}_{\mathbf{T}_2}\vec{\mathbf{G}}(E)_{x,\vec{r}}$. By Definition 5.13, $\mathbf{G}^0(E)_{x,0} = {}_{\mathbf{T}_1}\vec{\mathbf{G}}(E)_{x,(0,\infty,\ldots,\infty)}$, so, by Corollary 5.18, $\mathbf{G}^0(E)_{x,0}$ normalizes ${}_{\mathbf{T}_1}\vec{\mathbf{G}}(E)_{x,\vec{r}}$. Thus in fact ${}_{\mathbf{T}_1}\vec{\mathbf{G}}(E)_{x,\vec{r}} = {}_{\mathbf{T}_2}\vec{\mathbf{G}}(E)_{x,\vec{r}}$. As in the proof of Lemma 5.19, we conclude that ${}_{\mathbf{T}_1}\vec{G}_{x,\vec{r}} = {}_{\mathbf{T}_2}\vec{G}_{x,\vec{r}}$. $\square$

Corollary 5.21. *$G^0 \cap \operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x})$ normalizes $\vec{G}_{x,\vec{r}}$ for any admissible sequence $\vec{r}$.*

Proof. This follows from Lemmata 5.19 and 5.20. □

For the remainder of this section, suppose that L/F is a Galois subextension of E/F such that

- $\mathbf{G}$ is L-quasisplit,
- $\mathbf{T}$ contains a maximal L-split torus $\mathbf{S}^\sharp$ (necessarily defined over F), and
- ${}_L\Phi(\mathbf{G})$ is reduced.

Note that, by Proposition 15.5.3(iii) of [44], $\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S}^\sharp)$ is the set of $\operatorname{Gal}(E/L)$-orbits in $\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$, so that f may also be regarded as a function on $\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S}^\sharp)$. For $(a, c) \in \mathbf{X}_*(\mathbf{S}^\sharp) \times \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}$ with $c < \infty$, write $a + c$ as a shorthand for the unique affine function φ on $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S}^\sharp)$ with $\dot{\varphi} = a$ and $\varphi(x) = c$. If $c = \infty$, then write $a + c$ for the constant function with value ∞ on $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S}^\sharp)$.

Lemma 5.22. *Suppose that $f(0) > 0$. Then the multiplication map*

$$\mathsf{m}_f : \prod_{a \in \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S}^\sharp)} U_{a+f(a)} \longrightarrow {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f}$$

(the product taken in any order) is a continuous bijection.

Proof. By Proposition 6.4.48 of [12] and Lemma 3.2,

$$\mathsf{m}_{f,E} : \prod_{\alpha \in \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})} {}_E U_{\alpha+f(\alpha)} \longrightarrow {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,f}$$

is a bijection. (Here, we have ordered the product so that the factors corresponding to roots with the same restriction to $\mathbf{S}^\sharp$ are contiguous.) Since m_f is a restriction of $\mathsf{m}_{f,E}$, it suffices to show that m_f is surjective. Choose $g \in {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f} \subseteq {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,f}$, and denote by $(u_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})}$ its preimage under $\mathsf{m}_{f,E}$. Then $u_0 \in \mathbf{T}(E)_{f(0)}$; and, for $a \in \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S}^\sharp)$, Lemmata 3.1 and A.14 give $u_a := \prod_{\alpha|_{\mathbf{S}^\sharp} = a} u_\alpha \in U_{a+f(a)}$. In particular, $u_a \in \mathbf{G}(L)_{y,0}$ for $a \in \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S}^\sharp)$, so $u_0 \in \mathbf{G}(L)_{y,0}$ also. By Lemmata 3.6 and 3.8,

$$u_0 \in \mathbf{T}(E)_{f(0)} \cap \mathbf{G}(L)_{y,0} = \mathbf{T}(E)_{f(0)} \cap \mathbf{T}(L)_0 = \mathbf{T}(L)_{f(0)} = U_{0+f(0)}\,.$$

Then $(u_a)_{a \in \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S}^\sharp)}$ is in the domain of m, and clearly $g = \mathsf{m}_f((u_a))$. □

Remark 5.23. If $f(0) > 0$, then, by Lemma 5.22, ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f}$ is generated by the root subgroups U_φ with φ an affine L-root satisfying $\varphi(x) = f(\dot{\varphi})$. In the notation of [12, §6.4.2], ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f} = X \cdot U_{f^\perp}$, where $X = U_{0+f(0)} \subseteq \mathbf{T}(L)_{\mathrm{b}}$ and $f^\perp$ is the restriction of f to $\Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$. Thus, if $\mathbf{T}$ is L-split, then the group ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f}$ constructed here is the same as the one constructed in

Definition 5.13. (We will prove later that, if L is sufficiently large for $\mathbf{T}$ and y, then this is true even if $f(0) = 0$. See Lemma 5.28.)

Corollary 5.24. *If $f(0) > 0$, then there is a point $x' \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T}, F)$ such that, for any subextension K/F of L/F with L/K tame, we have ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(K)_{x,f} = {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f} \cap \mathbf{G}(K)_{x',0+}$.*

Proof. By Lemma B.3, for δ sufficiently small, f_δ is concave. Since L is discretely valued, we have that, for δ smaller still, $U_{a+f(a)} = U_{a+f_\delta(a)}$ for $a \in \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S}^\sharp)$, hence, by Remark 5.23, that ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f} = {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_\delta}$. By Lemma 5.12, there is a strictly (x, f_δ)-positive point x'. In particular, for any $a \in \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S}^\sharp)$, we have that $(a + f_\delta(a))(x') > 0$, so $U_{a+f_\delta(a)} \subseteq \mathbf{G}(L)_{x',0+}$. Therefore, by another application of Remark 5.23, ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_\delta} \subseteq \mathbf{G}(L)_{x',0+}$. It is an easy consequence of Definition 5.14 and Lemma 3.9 that ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(K)_{x,f} = {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f} \cap \mathbf{G}(K)_0$. Since L/K is tame, we have by Lemma 3.7 that

$$\begin{aligned}{}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(K)_{x,f} &= {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f} \cap \mathbf{G}(K)_0 \\ &= {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f} \cap \mathbf{G}(L)_{x',0+} \cap \mathbf{G}(K) = {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f} \cap \mathbf{G}(K)_{x',0+}. \quad \square\end{aligned}$$

Corollary 5.25. *Suppose that*

- *f_j is a $\operatorname{Gal}(E/F)$-invariant, concave function with $f_j(0) > 0$ for $j = 1, 2$,*
- *$f_2 \geq f_1$,*
- *$f_1 \vee f_2 \geq f_2$, and*
- *$(f_1 \vee f_2)(\alpha) > f_2(\alpha)$ whenever $f_2(\alpha) < \infty$.*

(Here, the operator $\vee$ is as in Definition B.1.) Then the composition

$$\prod_{a \in \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S}^\sharp)} U_{a+f_1(a)} \xrightarrow{\mathsf{m}_{f_1}} {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_1} \longrightarrow {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_1:f_2}$$

induces a continuous bijection

$$\mathsf{m}_{f_1:f_2} : \prod_{a \in \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S}^\sharp)} U_{(a+f_1(a)):(a+f_2(a))} \longrightarrow {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_1:f_2}.$$

Proof. By Lemma B.3, for δ and ε sufficiently small, the function $f_{j,\delta}$ defined in that lemma is concave for $j = 1, 2$, and $f_{1,\delta} \vee f_{2,\delta} \geq f_{2,\delta} + \varepsilon$ (with notation as in the statement of that lemma). Since L is discretely valued, we have that, for δ smaller still, $U_{a+f_j(a)} = U_{a+f_{j,\delta}(a)}$ for $a \in \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S})$, hence, by Remark 5.23, that ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_j} = {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_{j,\delta}}$, for $j = 1, 2$. Let δ and ε be so small that all of the above conditions are satisfied. Then we may, and hence do, replace f_j by $f_{j,\delta}$ for $j = 1, 2$, so that $f_1 \vee f_2 \geq f_2 + \varepsilon$.

Define concave functions f_j for $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{>2}$ by $f_j = f_2 + (j-2)\varepsilon$. Then the groups ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_j}$ are a basis of neighborhoods of the identity in ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_2}$.

By normality of ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_2}$, the indicated composition is constant on cosets of $\prod U_{a+f_2(a)}$. Thus, there is a map $\mathsf{m}_{f_1:f_2}$ as indicated. It is clearly continuous and surjective.

To show injectivity, suppose that $\vec{u}_1, \vec{u}_2 \in \prod U_{a+f_1(a)}$ satisfy $\mathsf{m}_{f_1:f_2}(\vec{u}_1) = \mathsf{m}_{f_1:f_2}(\vec{u}_2)$. By Lemma 3.2, there is a complete subfield L' of L such that

- $\mathbf{G}$ is defined over L',
- $\mathbf{S}^\sharp$ is split over L',
- $x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, L')$, and
- $\vec{u}_1, \vec{u}_2 \in \prod{}_{L'} U_{a+f_1(a)}$.

Upon replacing L by L', we may, and hence do, assume that L is complete. Now suppose that $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$ and $\vec{u}_j \in \vec{u}_2 \prod U_{a+f_2(a)}$ satisfies $\mathsf{m}_{f_1:f_j}(\vec{u}_1) = \mathsf{m}_{f_1:f_j}(\vec{u}_j)$. Put

$$\vec{w} = \mathsf{m}_{f_j}^{-1}(\mathsf{m}_{f_1}(\vec{u}_j)^{-1}\mathsf{m}_{f_1}(\vec{u}_1)).$$

Since $f_1 \vee f_j \geq (f_1 \vee f_2) + (j-2)\varepsilon \geq f_2 + (j-1)\varepsilon = f_{j+1}$, Lemma 5.17 gives $[{}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_1}, {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_j}] \subseteq {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_{j+1}}$. In particular,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{m}_{f_1}(\vec{u}_1) = \mathsf{m}_{f_1}(\vec{u}_j)\mathsf{m}_{f_j}(\vec{w}) &= \Bigl(\prod u_{j,a}\Bigr)\Bigl(\prod w_a\Bigr)\\ &\equiv \prod(u_{j,a}w_a) = \mathsf{m}_{f_1}(\vec{u}_j\vec{w}) \pmod{{}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_{j+1}}}.\end{aligned}$$

Put $\vec{u}_{j+1} := \vec{u}_j\vec{w}$. Then $(\vec{u}_j)_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}}$ is a Cauchy sequence, say with limit $\vec{v}$. We have $\vec{v} \in \vec{u}_2 \prod U_{a+f_2(a)}$; and $\mathsf{m}_{f_1}(\vec{v}) = \lim_{j\longrightarrow\infty} \mathsf{m}_{f_1}(\vec{u}_j) = \mathsf{m}_{f_1}(\vec{u}_1)$, so $\vec{v} = \vec{u}_1$. □

Corollary 5.26. *With notation as in Corollary 5.25, if* ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_2}$ *contains* $[{}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_1}, {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_1}]$*, then* $\mathsf{m}_{f_1:f_2}$ *is a* $\operatorname{Gal}(L/F)$*-equivariant isomorphism.*

Proof. Since

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{m}_{f_1}(\vec{u})\mathsf{m}_{f_1}(\vec{u}') &= \bigl(\prod u_a\bigr)\bigl(\prod u'_a\bigr)\\ &\equiv \prod(u_a u'_a) = \mathsf{m}_{f_1}(\vec{u}\,\vec{u}') \pmod{[{}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_1}, {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_1}]}\end{aligned}$$

for $\vec{u}, \vec{u}' \in \prod U_{a+f_1(a)}$, we have that $\mathsf{m}_{f_1:f_2}$ is a homomorphism. We have already shown that it is a bijection.

Now note that ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_1:f_2}$ is stable under the $\operatorname{Gal}(L/F)$-action on $\mathbf{G}(L)$. The $\operatorname{Gal}(L/F)$-action on the domain of $\mathsf{m}_{f_1:f_2}$ is deduced from the action on $\prod U_{a+f_1(a)}$ defined by $(\sigma\vec{u})_a := \sigma u_{\sigma^{-1}a}$ for $\vec{u} \in \prod U_{a+f_1(a)}$, $a \in \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S}^\sharp)$, and $\sigma \in \operatorname{Gal}(L/F)$. Equivariance follows from the fact that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{m}_{f_1}(\sigma\vec{u}) &= \prod \sigma u_{\sigma^{-1}a} \equiv \prod \sigma u_a\\ &= \sigma\bigl(\prod u_a\bigr) = \sigma\mathsf{m}_{f_1}(\vec{u}) \pmod{[{}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_1}, {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_1}]}. \quad \square\end{aligned}$$

Remark 5.27. Although we do not need to do so, one can use Corollary 5.26 to show that m_{f_1} is an open map, hence a homeomorphism.

Lemma 5.28. *The group ${}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f}$ is independent of the separable extension of F chosen as a sufficiently large field for $\mathbf{T}$ and y.*

Proof. To obviate some confusion, we will temporarily use the notation ${}^*_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(\cdot)_{x,f}$ for the groups constructed in Definition 5.13, where the ground field was assumed to be sufficiently large. It is enough to show that, if F is sufficiently large, then ${}^*_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f} = {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f}$, i.e., that ${}^*_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f} = {}^*_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,f} \cap G_0$. Upon replacing x by y and f by h, we may, and hence do, assume that f is non-negative and F is sufficiently large for $\mathbf{T}$ and x. Since the containment ${}^*_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,f} \cap G_0 \supseteq {}^*_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f}$ is obvious, we consider only the reverse containment. By Lemma 5.16, ${}^*_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,f} \cap G_0 \subseteq G_{x,0}$, so it suffices to show ${}^*_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,f} \cap G_{x,0} \subseteq {}^*_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f}$.

Put $f_+ = \max\{0+, f\}$. Clearly, $f \vee f_+ \geq f \vee f \geq f$. On the other hand, fix $\alpha \in \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$ and let $(a_m)_m$ and $(b_n)_n$ be any finite non-empty sequences in $\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$ such that $\sum_m a_m + \sum_n b_n = \alpha$. Let b_{n_0} be any term of $(b_n)_n$. Then

$$\sum_m f(a_m) + \sum_n f_+(b_n) \geq f_+(b_{n_0}) \geq 0+.$$

Thus, $(f \vee f_+)(\alpha) \geq 0+$. Since $\alpha \in \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$ was arbitrary, we have $f \vee f_+ \geq \max\{0+, f\} = f_+$. By Lemma 5.17, ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,f_+}$ is normal in ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,f}$. Notice that ${}^*_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,f:f_+}$ is generated by the subgroups ${}_EU_{\psi:\psi+}$, where ψ is an affine E-root satisfying ${}_EU_\psi \neq {}_EU_{\psi+}$ and $\psi(x) = 0 = f(\dot{\psi})$. Choose such a ψ. Since $\psi(x) \in \operatorname{ord}(F^\times)$ and F is sufficiently large for $\mathbf{T}$ and x, Remark 5.6 gives ${}_FU_\psi \neq {}_FU_{\psi+}$. The map $F_0 \cong {}_FU_\psi \longrightarrow {}_EU_\psi \cong E_0$, deduced from the isomorphisms $F \longrightarrow U_{\dot{\psi}}$ and $E \longrightarrow \mathbf{U}_{\dot{\psi}}(E)$ of §3.3, restricts to a map $F_{0+} \cong {}_FU_{\psi+} \longrightarrow {}_EU_{\psi+} \cong E_{0+}$. Since $\mathfrak{f}_E/\mathfrak{f}$ is algebraic, and $\mathfrak{f}$ is separably (hence algebraically, since it is perfect) closed, the induced map $\mathfrak{f} = F^{\text{un}}_{0:0+} \longrightarrow E_{0:0+} = \mathfrak{f}_E$ is an isomorphism. Therefore, ${}_FU_{\psi:\psi+} \longrightarrow {}_EU_{\psi:\psi+}$ is also an isomorphism; in particular, ${}_EU_\psi \subseteq {}_FU_\psi \cdot {}_EU_{\psi+}$.

Thus ${}^*_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,f} \subseteq {}^*_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f} \cdot {}^*_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,f_+}$, so ${}^*_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,f} \cap G_{x,0} \subseteq {}^*_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f} \cdot ({}^*_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,f_+} \cap G_{x,0})$. By Lemma 5.16, ${}^*_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,f_+} \cap G_{x,0} = {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f_+}$ which, by Remark 5.23, equals ${}^*_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f_+}$. We are finished. ☐

Lemma 5.29. *Suppose that*

- $\mathbf{G}'$ *is a connected compatibly filtered reductive F-subgroup of* $\mathbf{G}$ *containing* $\mathbf{T}$*;*
- I *is some indexing set; and*

- *for each* $i \in I$*, we have a* $\operatorname{Gal}(E/F)$*-invariant, concave function* f_i *on* $\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$*, constant on* $\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}', \mathbf{T})$*, such that there exists a* $\operatorname{Gal}(E/F)$*-invariant, concave function* g_i *for which*
  - $g_i(0) > 0$*,*
  - ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}'(E)_{x,f_i(0)}$ *normalizes* ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,g_i}$ *,*
  - $f_i \le g_i$*, and*
  - $f_i = g_i$ *off* $\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}', \mathbf{T})$*.*

Then

$$\bigcap_{i \in I} {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f_i} = {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,\max_{i\in I} f_i} .$$

Note that, if $\{\, f_i \mid i \in I \,\}$ is any collection of $\operatorname{Gal}(E/F)$-invariant, concave functions on $\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$ such that $f_i(0) > 0$ for $i \in I$, then we may take $\mathbf{G}' = \mathbf{T}$ and $g_i = f_i$ in the above lemma.

Proof. By the definition of ${}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,(\cdot)}$, it suffices to show that

$$\bigcap_{i \in I} {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,f_i} = {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,\max_{i\in I} f_i} .$$

In fact, one containment being obvious, it suffices to show that

$$\bigcap_{i \in I} {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,f_i} \subseteq {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,\max_{i\in I} f_i} .$$

Fix $i \in I$. By Definition 5.13, ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,f_i}$ is generated by $\mathbf{G}'(E)_{x,f_i(0)}$ and ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,g_i}$. Since $\mathbf{G}'(E)_{x,f_i(0)}$ normalizes ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,g_i}$, we have that ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,f_i} = \mathbf{G}'(E)_{x,f_i(0)} \cdot {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,g_i}$. By Lemma 5.22,

$${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,f_i} = \mathbf{G}'(E)_{x,f_i(0)} \cdot \prod U_{\alpha+g_i(\alpha)} = \mathbf{G}'(E)_{x,f_i(0)} \cdot \prod U_{\alpha+f_i(\alpha)} ,$$

where the unlabelled products, here and for the remainder of this proof, run over $\alpha \in \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T}) \smallsetminus \Phi(\mathbf{G}', \mathbf{T})$. (Here, the notation $\alpha + c$ is as in Lemma 5.22.) In particular, for each $i \in I$, ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,f_i}$ lies in the image of the multiplication map $\mathsf{m}_{\mathbf{G}'}$ of Lemma A.14, and, by loc. cit., its preimage under that map is precisely $\mathbf{G}'(E)_{x,f_i(0)} \times \prod U_{\alpha+f_i(\alpha)}$. Thus $\bigcap_{i\in I} {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,f_i}$ lies in the image of $\mathsf{m}_{\mathbf{G}'}$, and its preimage under that map is precisely

$$\bigcap_{i \in I} \mathbf{G}'(E)_{x,f_i(0)} \times \prod \bigcap_{i \in I} U_{\alpha+f_i(\alpha)} = \mathbf{G}'(E)_{x,(\max_{i\in I} f_i)(0)} \times \prod U_{\alpha+(\max_{i\in I} f_i)(\alpha)} ;$$

so $\bigcap_{i\in I} {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,f_i}$ is contained in ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,\max_{i\in I} f_i}$, as desired. □

Lemma 5.30. *Suppose that*

- $\gamma \in Z(G^0) \cap \operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x})$*;*
- $\vec{s} = (s_0, \dots, s_d)$ *and* $\vec{t} = (t_0, \dots, t_d)$ *are admissible sequences;*
- $\min\limits_{0 \le i \le d} s_i > 0$*;*

- $\vec{t} \geq \vec{s}$;
- *for all* $0 < i \leq d$, *either* $t_i = \infty$ *or* $t_i < \min\bigl\{ s_i + \min\limits_{0 \leq j \leq d} t_j, s_k + t_k \bigm| i < k \leq d \bigr\}$;
- $h \in \vec{G}_{x,\vec{s}} \cdot G^0$; *and*
- $[\gamma, h] \in \vec{G}_{x,\vec{t}}$.

Put $\vec{r} = (r_0, r_1, \dots, r_d)$, *where* $r_0 = \min\bigl\{ s_k + t_k \bigm| 0 < k \leq d \bigr\}$, *and* $r_i = t_i$ *for* $0 < i \leq d$. *Then* $[\gamma, h] \in \vec{G}_{x,\vec{r}}$.

Proof. By construction, $\vec{r}$ is admissible. We may assume that $r_0 > t_0$, since otherwise there is nothing to prove. Let $f_{\vec{\mathbf{G}},\vec{s}}$, $f_{\vec{\mathbf{G}},\vec{t}}$, and $f_{\vec{\mathbf{G}},\vec{r}}$ be the concave functions associated to $\vec{s}$, $\vec{t}$, and $\vec{r}$, respectively. (See Definition 5.14.) Then one checks, as in the proof of Corollary 5.18, that $f_{\vec{\mathbf{G}},\vec{s}} \vee f_{\vec{\mathbf{G}},\vec{t}} \geq f_{\vec{\mathbf{G}},\vec{t}}$ and $(f_{\vec{\mathbf{G}},\vec{s}} \vee f_{\vec{\mathbf{G}},\vec{t}})(\alpha) > f_{\vec{\mathbf{G}},\vec{t}}(\alpha)$ whenever $f_{\vec{\mathbf{G}},\vec{t}}(\alpha) < \infty$; and similarly for $f_{\vec{\mathbf{G}},\vec{s}} \vee f_{\vec{\mathbf{G}},\vec{r}}$.

Now write $h = h'h_0$, with $h_0 \in G^0$ and $h' \in \vec{G}_{x,\vec{s}}$. Then $[\gamma, h] = [\gamma, h']$. By Lemma 5.22, we may write

$$h' = \Bigl(\prod_{\alpha \in \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{T}) \smallsetminus \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}^0,\mathbf{T})} h_\alpha \Bigr) \cdot \Bigl(\prod_{\alpha \in \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}^0,\mathbf{T})} h_\alpha \Bigr),$$

with $h_\alpha \in {}_E U_{\alpha + f_{\vec{\mathbf{G}},\vec{s}}(\alpha)}$ for $\alpha \in \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$. (Here, the notation $\alpha + c$ is as in Lemma 5.22.) Then the commutator of γ with h' is the same as the commutator of γ with $\prod_{\alpha \in \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{T}) \smallsetminus \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}^0,\mathbf{T})} h_\alpha$. (For the remainder of this proof, all products should be understood as products over the same collection of roots as above.) In particular, this latter commutator lies in $\vec{\mathbf{G}}(E)_{x,\vec{t}}$. That is, $\prod \operatorname{Int}(\gamma) h_\alpha \equiv \prod h_\alpha \pmod{\vec{\mathbf{G}}(E)_{x,\vec{t}}}$. By Corollary 5.25, this means that

$$\operatorname{Int}(\gamma) h_\alpha \equiv h_\alpha \pmod{{}_E U_{\alpha + f_{\vec{\mathbf{G}},\vec{t}}(\alpha)} = {}_E U_{\alpha + f_{\vec{\mathbf{G}},\vec{r}}(\alpha)} \subseteq \vec{\mathbf{G}}(E)_{x,\vec{r}}}$$

for α as above, hence (since $\vec{\mathbf{G}}(E)_{x,\vec{s}}$ normalizes $\vec{\mathbf{G}}(E)_{x,\vec{r}}$) that

$$\operatorname{Int}(\gamma)\Bigl(\prod h_\alpha\Bigr) = \prod \operatorname{Int}(\gamma) h_\alpha \equiv \prod h_\alpha \pmod{\vec{\mathbf{G}}(E)_{x,\vec{r}}};$$

i.e., $[\gamma, h] = [\gamma, \prod h_\alpha] \in \vec{\mathbf{G}}(E)_{x,\vec{r}}$. By Lemma 5.16, we have $\vec{G}_{x,\vec{t}} \subseteq G_{x,0}$. Since $[\gamma, h] \in \vec{G}_{x,\vec{t}}$, we have $[\gamma, h] \in \vec{\mathbf{G}}(E)_{x,\vec{r}} \cap G_{x,0} = \vec{G}_{x,\vec{r}}$, as desired. □

5.3. **Tame descent.** We keep the notation of §5.2. In particular, L/F satisfies the hypotheses introduced before Lemma 5.22. For the remainder of the section, suppose in addition that L/F is tame; that is, that Hypothesis (A) holds. Let N/F be the maximal unramified subextension of L/F.

Remember that, by Lemma 3.2, F is an unramified extension of a complete subfield. If F' is such a subfield, then L/F' is tame, hence separable, and the Galois closure $\widetilde{L}$ of L over F' is again a tame, discretely valued extension of F'. Thus we may, and hence do, assume that there is some complete subfield F' of F such that L/F' is Galois. However, we will not need this assumption until Lemma 5.37.

If $\operatorname{char} \mathfrak{f} = 0$, then we assume in addition that L is strictly Henselian. Since the strict Henselization of a Galois extension is again Galois, this is compatible with the assumption above. Note that then N is also strictly Henselian. Thus, by the proof of Proposition IV.2.8 of [37], L/N is cyclic. However, we will not need this assumption until Lemma 5.36.

Remark 5.31. Suppose that there is a connected, reductive, compatibly filtered F-subgroup $\mathbf{H}$ of $\mathbf{G}$, containing $\mathbf{T}$, such that f is identically ∞ off $\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{T})$. Denote by M the maximum value of f on $\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{T})$. Clearly, ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,f} \supseteq \mathbf{H}(E)_{x,M}$, so Lemmata 3.7 and 4.4 give

$$ {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f} = {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,f} \cap G_0 \supseteq \mathbf{H}(E)_{x,M} \cap H_0 \supseteq H_{x,M} . $$

Now suppose that f is non-negative, and put $m = \min f$. If $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{G}$ and $m = 0$, then, by Lemma 5.16, ${}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f} \subseteq G_{x,0} = H_{x,m}$. If $m > 0$, then let $\overline{m}$ be the concave function on $\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$ which takes the value m on $\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{T})$, and is ∞ off it. By Lemma 5.22, ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L^{\mathrm{un}})_{x,\overline{m}} = \mathbf{H}(L^{\mathrm{un}})_{x,m}$, so Lemma 3.7 gives

$$ {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f} \subseteq {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,\overline{m}} \subseteq {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L^{\mathrm{un}})_{x,\overline{m}}^{\operatorname{Gal}(L^{\mathrm{un}}/F)} = \mathbf{H}(L^{\mathrm{un}})_{x,m}^{\operatorname{Gal}(L^{\mathrm{un}}/F)} = H_{x,m} . $$

In particular, if f takes the value $c \in \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{\geq 0}$ everywhere on $\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{T})$, and $c > 0$ or $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{G}$, then ${}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f} = H_{x,c}$.

Lemma 5.32. *Suppose that $s' \in \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{\geq 0}$ and $\vec{s}$ is an admissible sequence. Then $[G^0_{x,s'}, \vec{G}_{x,\vec{s}}] \subseteq \vec{G}_{x,s'+\vec{s}}$.*

Proof. Put $\vec{s}^{(1)} = (s', \infty, \dots, \infty)$ and $\vec{s}^{(2)} = \vec{s}$. By Remark 5.31, we have $G^0_{x,s'} = \vec{G}_{x,\vec{s}^{(1)}}$. Now the result follows from Corollary 5.18. □

Lemma 5.33. *Suppose that K/F is a discretely valued tame extension. If K/F is unramified or $f(0) > 0$, then ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(K)_{x,f} \cap G = {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f}$.*

Proof. It is clear that the right-hand side is contained in the left, so we need only show the reverse containment. By Lemma 5.28, we may, and hence do, assume that $K \subseteq E$. Note that the composite extension KL/F remains tame, so we may, and hence do, assume further that $K \subseteq L$. If K/F is unramified, then let $x' \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F)$ be an (x, f)-positive point. (For example, we could take $x' = y$, where (y, h) is the pair introduced at the beginning of §5.2.) By Lemmata 3.7 and 5.16 (applied twice), we have that

$$ {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(K)_{x,f} \cap G = {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,f} \cap \mathbf{G}(K)_{x',0} \cap G = {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,f} \cap G_{x',0} = {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f} , $$

as desired.

If $f(0) > 0$, then, since L/K is tame, we have by Corollary 5.24 that there is a point $x' \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F)$ with ${}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f} = {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f} \cap G_{x',0+}$ and ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(K)_{x,f} = {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f} \cap \mathbf{G}(K)_{x',0+}$ Since K/F is tame, we have by Lemma 3.7 that $G_{x',0+} = \mathbf{G}(K)_{x',0+} \cap G$. Combining these three equations, we find that ${}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f} = {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(K)_{x,f} \cap G$, as desired. □

Remark 5.34. If there is a tame extension over which $\vec{\mathbf{G}}$ splits, then Lemma 5.33 shows that the definition of ${}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f}$ here coincides with the one in [48, §13] when $f(0) > 0$.

Until the end of the proof of Lemma 5.36 only, put $p = \operatorname{char} \mathfrak{f}$ and call a $\operatorname{Gal}(L/F)$-group $\mathcal{G}$ *p-filtered* if it possesses a filtration $(\mathcal{G}_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}$ by closed normal $\operatorname{Gal}(L/F)$-subgroups such that $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_0$, $\mathcal{G} = \varprojlim \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{G}_i$, and

- $p > 0$ and $\mathcal{G}_i/\mathcal{G}_{i+1}$ is an Abelian p-torsion group; or
- $p = 0$ and $\mathcal{G}_i/\mathcal{G}_{i+1}$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-vector space on which $\operatorname{Gal}(L/F)$ acts linearly

for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Note that, if $p > 0$ (but not necessarily if $p = 0$), then a $\operatorname{Gal}(L/F)$-subgroup or $\operatorname{Gal}(L/F)$-quotient of a p-filtered group is again p-filtered.

Remark 5.35. If $p > 0$, then $\mathcal{G} := \mathbf{G}(L)_{x',0+}$ is clearly p-filtered (with $\mathcal{G}_i = \mathbf{G}(L)_{x',2^i\varepsilon}$, say, for $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ sufficiently small) for any $x' \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F)$; so, if $f(0) > 0$, then Corollary 5.24 shows that ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f}$ is p-filtered. In particular, in case $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{T}$, we see that $\mathbf{T}(L)_c$, hence $\mathbf{T}(L)_{c:d}$, is p-filtered for any $c, d \in \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{\geq 0}$ with $c \leq d$.

If $p = 0$, then $\mathbf{T}$ (indeed, any L-torus) is a tame L-torus, so, by Proposition 5.5 of [49], $\mathbf{T}(L)_{c:d}$ is p-filtered for any $c, d \in \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{>0}$ with $c \leq d$. Then, by Lemma B.3 and Corollary 5.26, ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f}$ is p-filtered if $(f \vee f)(\alpha) > f(\alpha)$ whenever $f(\alpha) < \infty$.

Recall that N/F is the maximal unramified subextension of L/F.

Lemma 5.36. *Suppose that A is a $\operatorname{Gal}(L/F)$-group, and B a closed $\operatorname{Gal}(L/F)$-subgroup. Suppose further that B and A/B are p-filtered. Then the natural map*

$$H^1(N/F, A^{\operatorname{Gal}(L/N)}/B^{\operatorname{Gal}(L/N)}) \longrightarrow H^1(L/F, A/B)$$

is a bijection.

Proof. Note that it suffices to prove that $H^1(L/N, C) = \{0\}$ when C is p-filtered. Indeed, once we have done so, we will have the exact sequences

$$B^{\operatorname{Gal}(L/N)} \longrightarrow A^{\operatorname{Gal}(L/N)} \longrightarrow (A/B)^{\operatorname{Gal}(L/N)} \longrightarrow H^1(L/N, B) = 0$$

(by Proposition I.5.5.38 of [39]), so that $(A/B)^{\operatorname{Gal}(L/N)} = A^{\operatorname{Gal}(L/N)}/B^{\operatorname{Gal}(L/N)}$, and

$$0 \longrightarrow H^1(N/F, (A/B)^{\operatorname{Gal}(L/N)}) \longrightarrow H^1(L/F, A/B) \longrightarrow H^1(L/N, A/B) = 0$$

(by §5.8(a) of loc. cit.).

By Proposition 2.8 of [48] and Proposition I.5.5.38 of [39], it suffices to prove that $H^1(L/N, C) = \{0\}$ when $p > 0$ and C is an Abelian p-torsion group, or $p = 0$ and C is a $\mathbb{Q}$-vector space on which $\operatorname{Gal}(L/N)$ acts linearly.

In the former case, note that every element of the cohomology group $H^1(L/N, C)$ has p-power order. On the other hand, by Proposition I.2.4.9 of [39], every element has order dividing the cardinality of $\operatorname{Gal}(L/N)$, which is indivisible by p. Thus, $H^1(L/N, C) = \{0\}$.

In the latter case, recall that our assumptions on L imply that L/N is cyclic, say with generator σ. Since σ has finite order, say e, it acts semisimply on C, so $C = \ker(\sigma - 1) + \operatorname{im}(\sigma - 1)$. Now $\sum_{i=0}^{e-1} \sigma$ vanishes on $\operatorname{im}(\sigma - 1)$, and acts on $\ker(\sigma - 1)$ as multiplication by e, so $\ker(\sigma - 1) = \operatorname{im} \sum_{i=0}^{e-1} \sigma$; that is, $H^1(L/N, C) = H^1(\langle\sigma\rangle, C) = \{0\}$. □

Lemma 5.37. *With the notation and hypotheses of Corollary 5.26, suppose further that* $f_2(\alpha) < \infty$ *whenever* $\alpha \in \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$ *and* $f_1(\alpha) < \infty$. *Then the natural map*

$$H^1(N/F, \mathbf{T}(N)_{f_1(0):f_2(0)}) \longrightarrow H^1(L/F, {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_1:f_2})$$

is an isomorphism.

Recall that N/F is the maximal unramified subextension of L/F.

Proof. By Remark 5.35 and Lemma 5.36, $H^1(N/F, \mathbf{T}(N)_{f_1(0):f_2(0)}) \cong H^1(L/F, \mathbf{T}(L)_{f_1(0):f_2(0)})$; so it suffices to show that the natural map $H^1(L/F, \mathbf{T}(L)_{f_1(0):f_2(0)}) \longrightarrow H^1(L/F, {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_1:f_2})$ is an isomorphism. By Corollary 5.26 (with notation $a + c$ as in Lemma 5.22), the multiplication map

$$\mathbf{T}(L)_{f_1(0):f_2(0)} \times \prod_{a\in\Phi(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{S}^\sharp)} U_{(a+f_1(a)):(a+f_2(a))} \longrightarrow {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_1:f_2}$$

is a $\operatorname{Gal}(L/F)$-equivariant isomorphism, so the natural map

$$\begin{aligned} H^1(L/F, \mathbf{T}(L)_{f_1(0):f_2(0)}) \times H^1(L/F, \textstyle\prod U_{(a+f_1(a)):(a+f_2(a))}) \\ \longrightarrow H^1(L/F, {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_1:f_2}) \end{aligned}$$

is also an isomorphism. By §3.3, there is a $\operatorname{Gal}(L/F)$-equivariant isomorphism $\prod U_{a+f_1(a)} \cong \bigoplus \mathfrak{u}_{a+f_1(a)}$ which restricts to a $\operatorname{Gal}(L/F)$-equivariant isomorphism $\prod U_{a+f_2(a)} \cong \bigoplus \mathfrak{u}_{a+f_2(a)}$, hence induces a $\operatorname{Gal}(L/F)$-equivariant isomorphism $\prod U_{(a+f_1(a)):(a+f_2(a))} \cong \bigoplus \mathfrak{u}_{(a+f_1(a)):(a+f_2(a))}$. Put

$$\mathcal{L}_j(L) := \bigoplus \mathfrak{u}_{a+f_j(a)} \subseteq \mathrm{Lie}(\mathbf{G})(L)$$

for $j = 1, 2$.

We need only show that $H^1(L/F, \mathcal{L}_1(L)/\mathcal{L}_2(L)) = \{0\}$. Put

$$\mathfrak{u} := \bigoplus_{\substack{a \in \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S}^\sharp) \\ f_1(a) < \infty}} \mathrm{Lie}(\mathbf{U}_a).$$

Remember that F contains a complete subfield F' such that L/F' is Galois. By Lemma 3.2, we may, and hence do, assume in addition that

- F/F' is unramified,
- $\mathbf{G}$, $\mathbf{T}$, $\mathbf{S}^\sharp$, and $\mathfrak{u}$ are defined over F', and
- $x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F')$.

By another application of Lemma 3.2, there is a finite subextension N'/F' of N/F' such that N/N' is unramified. By a third application of Lemma 3.2,

$$(*) \qquad H^1(L/F, \mathcal{L}_1(L)/\mathcal{L}_2(L)) = \varinjlim H^1(L/F, \mathcal{L}_1(L')/\mathcal{L}_2(L')),$$

where $\mathcal{L}_j(L') := \mathcal{L}_j(L) \cap \mathrm{Lie}(\mathbf{G})(L')$ for $j = 1, 2$, and L' runs over the collection of finite extensions of N' such that L'/F' is Galois and $\mathbf{S}^\sharp$ is L'-split. (Note that, in this setting, $\mathrm{Gal}(L/F)$ actually acts on L', hence on $\mathcal{L}_1(L')$ and $\mathcal{L}_2(L')$; so the cohomology above makes sense.)

Fix L' as above. Put $\widetilde{N}' := L' \cap N$ and $\widetilde{F}' := L' \cap F$. Then it is easy to check that $\widetilde{N}'$ and $\widetilde{F}'$ satisfy the hypotheses on N' and F' above, that $L'/\widetilde{F}'$ is tame, and that $\widetilde{N}'/\widetilde{F}'$ is its maximal unramified subextension. By Lemma 5.36,

$$\begin{aligned}(\dagger) \quad & H^1(L/F, \mathcal{L}_1(L')/\mathcal{L}_2(L')) \\ & \cong H^1(N/F, \mathcal{L}_1(L')^{\mathrm{Gal}(L/N)}/\mathcal{L}_2(L')^{\mathrm{Gal}(L/N)}) \\ & = H^1(N/F, \mathcal{L}_1(\widetilde{N}')/\mathcal{L}_2(\widetilde{N}')).\end{aligned}$$

By [39, §I.5.8(a)], we have an exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 1 \longrightarrow H^1(N/\widetilde{N}'F, \mathcal{L}_1(\widetilde{N}')/\mathcal{L}_2(\widetilde{N}')) &\longrightarrow H^1(N/F, \mathcal{L}_1(\widetilde{N}')/\mathcal{L}_2(\widetilde{N}')) \\ &\longrightarrow H^1(\widetilde{N}'F/F, \mathcal{L}_1(\widetilde{N}')/\mathcal{L}_2(\widetilde{N}')).\end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathrm{Gal}(N/\widetilde{N}'F)$ acts trivially on $\mathcal{L}_1(\widetilde{N}')/\mathcal{L}_2(\widetilde{N}')$, we have

$$H^1(N/\widetilde{N}'F, \mathcal{L}_1(\widetilde{N}')/\mathcal{L}_2(\widetilde{N}')) \cong \mathrm{Hom}\bigl(\mathrm{Gal}(N/\widetilde{N}'F), \mathcal{L}_1(\widetilde{N}')/\mathcal{L}_2(\widetilde{N}')\bigr).$$

Note that $\mathrm{Gal}(\widetilde{N}'F/F) \cong \mathrm{Gal}(\widetilde{N}'/\widetilde{F}')$, and that $\mathcal{L}_j(\widetilde{N}')$ is a $\mathrm{Gal}(\widetilde{N}'/\widetilde{F}')$-stable lattice in $\mathfrak{u}(\widetilde{N}') \cong \mathfrak{u}(\widetilde{F}') \otimes_{\widetilde{F}'} \widetilde{N}'$ for $j = 1, 2$. By Lemma 2.9 of [48] (the proof of which uses only completeness of $\widetilde{N}'$, not local compactness), we have

$$H^1(\widetilde{N}'F/F, \mathcal{L}_1(\widetilde{N}')/\mathcal{L}_2(\widetilde{N}')) = \{0\}\,. \tag{‡}$$

Thus

$$H^1(L/F, \mathcal{L}_1(L')/\mathcal{L}_2(L') \cong \operatorname{Hom}\bigl(\operatorname{Gal}(N/\widetilde{N}'F), \mathcal{L}_1(\widetilde{N}')/\mathcal{L}_2(\widetilde{N}')\bigr). \tag{$**$}$$

By $(*)$ and $(**)$, since $\bigcup_{L'}(L' \cap N)F = N$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &H^1(L/F, \mathcal{L}_1(L)/\mathcal{L}_2(L)) \\ &\cong \varinjlim \operatorname{Hom}\bigl(\operatorname{Gal}(N/(L' \cap N)F), \mathcal{L}_1(L' \cap N)/\mathcal{L}_2(L' \cap N)\bigr) = \{0\}\,. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 5.38. *With the notation and hypotheses of Lemma 5.37,*

$$H^1(L/F, {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_1:f_2}) = \{0\}\,.$$

Proof. By Lemma 5.37 and Proposition I.5.5.38 of [39], it suffices to show that $H^1(L/F, \mathbf{T}(L)_{x,c:c+}) = \{0\}$ for all $c \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. Since Remark 5.35 and Lemma 5.36 show that $H^1(N/F, \mathbf{T}(N)_{x,c:c+}) \cong H^1(L/F, \mathbf{T}(L)_{x,c:c+})$, the desired equality is Hypothesis (D). ☐

The next result is the analogue of Proposition 13.4 of [48].

Proposition 5.39. *Suppose that $f(0) > 0$ and $(f \vee f)(\alpha) > f(\alpha)$ whenever $f(\alpha) < \infty$. Then $H^1(L/F, {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f}) = \{0\}$.*

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 5.37, it suffices to show that

$$H^1(L/F, {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L')_{x,f}) \cong H^1(N/F, {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(N')_{x,f}) \tag{†}$$

and

$$H^1(N'/F', {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(N')_{x,f}) = \{0\} \tag{‡}$$

for any tower of complete subfields $L'/N'/F'$ of L such that

- L/F' and L'/F' are Galois,
- $N' = L' \cap N$ and $F' = L' \cap F$,
- F/F', N/N', and L/L' are unramified,
- $\mathbf{G}$, $\mathbf{T}$, $\mathbf{S}^\sharp$, and $\mathfrak{u}$ are defined over F', where $\mathfrak{u} := \bigoplus_{\substack{a \in \Phi(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{S}^\sharp) \\ f(a)<\infty}} \operatorname{Lie}(\mathbf{U}_a)$,
- $\mathbf{S}^\sharp$ is split over L', and
- $x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F')$.

Equation (†) follows from Remark 5.35 and Lemma 5.36. As in the proof of Corollary 5.25, we may, and hence do, assume that there is some $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $f \vee f \geq f + \varepsilon$. Then equation (‡) follows (as in the proof of Proposition 13.4 of [48]) from Proposition I.5.5.38 of [39], Lemma 2.8 of [48], and Corollary 5.38. ☐

The next result is the analogue of Lemma 13.3 of [48].

Proposition 5.40. *Suppose that, for* $j = 1, 2$*,* f_j *is a* $\operatorname{Gal}(E/F)$*-invariant, concave function on* $\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$ *such that* $f_j(0) > 0$*, and* $(f_j \vee f_j)(\alpha) > f_j(\alpha)$ *whenever* $f_j(\alpha) < \infty$*. Then*

$$\bigl({}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_1} \cdot {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_2}\bigr) \cap G = {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f_1} \cdot {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f_2}.$$

If moreover $\min\{f_1, f_2\}$ *is concave and* ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_1} \cdot {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_2}$ *is a group, then*

$${}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,\min\{f_1,f_2\}} = {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f_1} \cdot {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f_2}\,.$$

Proof. As in the proof of Corollary 5.25, we may, and hence do, assume that there is some $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that $f_j \vee f_j \geq f_j + \varepsilon$ for $j = 1, 2$. Then $\max\{f_1, f_2\} \vee \max\{f_1, f_2\} \geq \max\{f_1 + \varepsilon, f_2 + \varepsilon\} = \max\{f_1, f_2\} + \varepsilon$.

Consider the groups $A = {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,\max\{f_1,f_2\}}$ and $B = {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_1} \times {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_2}$. By identifying A with its image under the diagonal map, we may regard A as a subgroup of B. By Proposition I.5.4.36 of [39], we have an exact sequence (of pointed sets)

$$B^{\operatorname{Gal}(L/F)} \longrightarrow (B/A)^{\operatorname{Gal}(L/F)} \longrightarrow H^1(L/F, A).$$

By Proposition 5.39, $H^1(L/F, A) = \{1\}$, so the natural map $B^{\operatorname{Gal}(L/F)} \longrightarrow (B/A)^{\operatorname{Gal}(L/F)}$ is surjective. By Lemma 5.29, ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_1} \cap {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_2} = {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,\max\{f_1,f_2\}}$, so the map $(b_1, b_2) \mapsto b_1 b_2^{-1}$ identifies $(B/A)^{\operatorname{Gal}(L/F)}$ with $({}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_1} \cdot {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_2})^{\operatorname{Gal}(L/F)} = ({}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_1} \cdot {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_2}) \cap G$. By Lemma 5.33, $B^{\operatorname{Gal}(L/F)} = {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f_1} \times {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f_2}$. This proves the first statement of the lemma.

Now suppose that $\min\{f_1, f_2\}$ is concave. By Lemma 5.22, ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,\min\{f_1,f_2\}}$ is generated by ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_1}$ and ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_2}$. If ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_1} \cdot {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_2}$ is a group, then in fact ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,\min\{f_1,f_2\}} = {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_1} \cdot {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f_2}$. Since ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,\min\{f_1,f_2\}} \cap G = {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,\min\{f_1,f_2\}}$ by Lemma 5.33, the second statement follows. □

6. NORMAL APPROXIMATIONS: BASIC DEFINITIONS

Definition 6.1. Let $\mathcal{G}_0^G$ denote the set of elements $\gamma \in G$ such that $\overline{\gamma} \in \widetilde{G}$ is absolutely semisimple (in the sense of Definition 4.11).

For $d > 0$, $\gamma \in G$ is *good of depth* d if there is a tame-modulo-center torus $\mathbf{S}$ such that $\gamma \in S_d \smallsetminus S_{d+}$ and $\alpha(\gamma) = 1$ or $\operatorname{ord}(\alpha(\gamma) - 1) = d$ for all $\alpha \in \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S})$. (This is analogous to the definition of a good element of a Lie algebra in Definition 2.2.4 of [1].) Let $\mathcal{G}_d^G$ denote the set of such elements.

Remark 6.2. Note that an element of $\mathcal{G}_d^G$ with $d > 0$ has depth precisely d, but an element of $\mathcal{G}_0^G$ may have positive depth (in which case it belongs to $Z(G)$), or may not even belong to G_0. For every discretely valued separable extension E/F and $d \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, we have $\mathcal{G}_d^G \subseteq \mathcal{G}_d^{\mathbf{G}(E)}$.

Definition 6.3. Let E/F be a discretely valued algebraic extension. We say that an E-torus $\mathbf{S} \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ has property (**Gd**$^{\mathbf{G}(E)}$) if, for all $d > 0$, every coset in $\mathbf{S}(E)_{d:d+}$ intersects $\mathcal{G}_d^{\mathbf{G}(E)} \cup \{1\}$.

Definition 6.4. A collection $\underline{\gamma} = (\gamma_i)_{0 \le i < r'}$ of elements of G, where $r' \in \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{\ge 0}$ and $\gamma_i \in \mathcal{G}_i^G \cup \{1\}$ for $0 \le i < r'$, is called a *good sequence* (in G) if there is a tame F-torus $\mathbf{S}$ in $\mathbf{G}$ such that $\gamma_i \in S$ for all $0 \le i < r'$. (We will often omit those terms γ_i that are equal to 1 from the notation.) For $r \in \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}$ with $r \le r'$, put

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma}) &:= \Big(\bigcap_{0 \le i < r} C_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma_i)\Big)^{\circ}, \\ Z_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma}) &:= Z(C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma})), \\ C_G^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma}) &:= C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma})(F), \\ Z_G^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma}) &:= Z_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma})(F). \end{aligned}$$

By convention, $C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma}) = \mathbf{G}$, so $Z_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma}) = Z(\mathbf{G})$, for $r \le 0$.

Since the intersection defining $C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma})$ may be taken over a finite set, we see by repeated applications of Propositions 9.1(1) and 13.19 of [7] that $C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma})$ is reductive and defined over F. By Theorem 18.2(ii) of [7], $Z_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma})$ is defined over F. Thus, the definitions of $C_G^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma})$ and $Z_G^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma})$ make sense.

Note that $C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma})$ is a compatibly filtered F-subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$, by Proposition 4.6 and the definition of a good sequence.

For later use, it will be convenient to know that the groups $C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\gamma)$ descend well to Levi subgroups of $\mathbf{G}$.

Lemma 6.5. *Suppose that*

- *E/F is a discretely valued separable field extension,*
- *$\mathbf{M}$ is an E-Levi F-subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$, and*
- *$\underline{\gamma} = (\gamma_i)_{0 \le i < r'}$ is a good sequence in M and G.*

Then $C_{\mathbf{M}}^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma})$ equals $C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma}) \cap \mathbf{M}$, and is an E-Levi F-subgroup of $C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma})$ for $0 \le r \le r'$.

Proof. Put $\mathbf{H} = C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma})$. Clearly, $(\mathbf{H} \cap \mathbf{M})^{\circ} = C_{\mathbf{M}}^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma})$. Let $\mathbf{S}$ be the maximal E-split torus in the center of $\mathbf{M}$, so that $\mathbf{M} = C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S})$. Since $\underline{\gamma}$ is a good sequence in M, we have that $\mathbf{S} \subseteq \mathbf{H}$. Then $\mathbf{H} \cap \mathbf{M} = C_{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{S})$ is an E-Levi F-subgroup of $\mathbf{H}$. In particular, it is connected, so that $\mathbf{H} \cap \mathbf{M} = C_{\mathbf{M}}^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma})$, as desired. □

Definition 6.6. Let $\underline{\gamma}$ and $r \in \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}$ be as in Definition 6.4. Fix $x \in \mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma}), F)$ and $j \in \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}$. For this definition only, write

$$\vec{\mathbf{G}}(j) = (C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r-i)}(\underline{\gamma}))_{0<i<j}\,; \quad \vec{r}(j) = (i)_{0<i<j}\,; \quad \text{and} \quad \vec{s}(j) = (i/2)_{0<i<j}$$

(where i runs over the indicated elements in $\mathbb{R}$, not $\widetilde{\mathbb{R}}$). For $x \in \mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma}), F)$, put

$$[\underline{\gamma}; x, r]^{(j)} := \vec{G}(j)_{x,\vec{r}(j)} \quad \text{and} \quad \llbracket\underline{\gamma}; x, r\rrbracket^{(j)} := \vec{G}(2j)_{x,\vec{s}(2j)}.$$

(Here, we are using Remark 5.15 to handle "vectors" $\vec{r}(j)$ and $\vec{s}(j)$ with infinitely many entries. Note also that $[\underline{\gamma}; x, r]^{(j)}$ and $\llbracket\underline{\gamma}; x, r\rrbracket^{(j)}$ are just open subgroups of G, not sequences of such subgroups.) Put also $[\underline{\gamma}; x, r] = [\underline{\gamma}; x, r]^{(\infty)}$ and $\llbracket\underline{\gamma}; x, r\rrbracket = \llbracket\underline{\gamma}; x, r\rrbracket^{(\infty)}$.

Remark 6.7. If necessary, we will indicate the dependence of $[\underline{\gamma}; x, r]$ on G by denoting it by $[\underline{\gamma}; x, r]_G$, and similarly for $\llbracket\underline{\gamma}; x, r\rrbracket$, $[\underline{\gamma}; x, r]^{(j)}$, and $\llbracket\underline{\gamma}; x, r\rrbracket^{(j)}$. By Proposition 5.40, each of the groups defined above has a more concrete description. For example, $[\underline{\gamma}; x, r] = \prod_{0<i\le r} C_G^{(r-i)}(\underline{\gamma})_{x,i}$. These concrete descriptions make it easy to see the following (although they can also be verified directly).

(1) If $h + j \le r+$, and $r = r+$ or $h \in \mathbb{R}$ or $j \in \mathbb{R}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} [\underline{\gamma}; x, r]^{(j)} &\subseteq C_G^{(h)}(\gamma)_{x,0+}\,, \\ \llbracket\underline{\gamma}; x, r\rrbracket^{(j)} &\subseteq [\underline{\gamma}; x, h]^{(j)}, \\ G_{x,r} \subseteq [\underline{\gamma}; x, r] &\subseteq G_{x,0+}\,, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$G_{x,r/2} \subseteq \llbracket\underline{\gamma}; x, r\rrbracket \subseteq G_{x,0+}\,.$$

(2) By Lemma 5.16 and Remark 5.23, $[\underline{\gamma}; x, r]_{\mathbf{G}(E)} \cap G_{x,0} = [\underline{\gamma}; x, r]_{\mathbf{G}(E)} \cap G_{x,0+} = [\underline{\gamma}; x, r]_G$ for any discretely valued separable extension E/F.

(3) Suppose that $\mathbf{T}$ is an F-torus such that $(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{G}', \mathbf{G})$ is a tame reductive F-sequence, $\gamma \in T$, and $x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T}, F)$. Let E/F be a splitting field for $\mathbf{T}$, f_1 the concave function appearing in the definition of $[\underline{\gamma}; x, r]_{\mathbf{G}(E)}$, and f_2 the concave function appearing in the definition of $(\mathbf{G}', \mathbf{G})(E)_{x,(0+,\infty)}$. (See Definition 5.13.) By Remark 5.31, $(G', G)_{x,(0+,\infty)} = G'_{x,0+}$. Since $\mathbf{G}$ and $\mathbf{G}'$ are compatibly filtered over F, we have that $G_{x,0+} \cap G' = G'_{x,0+}$. Since, as above, $[\underline{\gamma}; x, r]_G \subseteq G_{x,0+}$, we have $[\underline{\gamma}; x, r]_G \cap G' = [\underline{\gamma}; x, r]_G \cap G'_{x,0+}$.

By Lemma 5.29, $[\underline{\gamma}; x, r]_G \cap G'_{x,0+} = {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,\max\{f_1,f_2\}}$. It is easy to verify that ${}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,\max\{f_1,f_2\}} = [\underline{\gamma}; x, r]_{G'}$. Thus,

$$[\underline{\gamma}; x, r]_G \cap G' = [\underline{\gamma}; x, r]_{G'}.$$

The analogous facts for $[\![\underline{\gamma}; x, r]\!]$, $[\underline{\gamma}; x, r]^{(j)}$, and $[\![\underline{\gamma}; x, r]\!]^{(j)}$ hold, with similar proofs.

(4) By an argument as in Remark 6.7(3), we see that, for $j > 0$ and $h \in \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}$, $[\underline{\gamma}; x, r] \cap C_G^{(h)}(\underline{\gamma})_{x,j}$ is the group associated to the vector of groups $(C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(\max\{r-i,h\})}(\underline{\gamma}))_{j \le i}$ and the vector of depths $(i)_{j \le i}$; and similarly for $[\![\underline{\gamma}; x, r]\!]^{(j)}$. Thus, by Proposition 5.40, if $h + j \le r$ and $h^\sharp + 2j \le r$, then

$$[\underline{\gamma}; x, r]^{(j)}([\underline{\gamma}; x, r] \cap C_G^{(h)}(\underline{\gamma})_{x,j}) = [\underline{\gamma}; x, r]$$

and

$$[\![\underline{\gamma}; x, r]\!]^{(j)}([\![\underline{\gamma}; x, r]\!] \cap C_G^{(h^\sharp)}(\underline{\gamma})_{x,j}) = [\![\underline{\gamma}; x, r]\!].$$

Definition 6.8. Suppose that

- $\gamma \in G$,
- $\underline{\gamma} = (\gamma_i)_{0 \le i < r'}$ is a good sequence, and
- $r \in \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}$ with $0 \le r \le r'$.

Then $\underline{\gamma}$ is an *r-approximation to γ (in G)* if there is a point $x \in \mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma}), F)$ such that $\gamma \in \bigl(\prod_{0 \le i < r} \gamma_i\bigr) G_{x,r}$ (or $\gamma \in \operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x})$, if $r = 0$). For emphasis, we will sometimes write that the pair $(\underline{\gamma}, x)$ is an r-approximation to γ. We say that it is a *normal r-approximation* to γ if $\gamma \in C_G^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma})$.

Note that the notion of a 0-approximation to γ is nearly trivial. This is intentional, and allows us to state Lemma 8.1 in a uniform fashion (i.e., without separating the cases $d = 0$ and $d > 0$).

Note also that a (normal) r-approximation may have terms with indices greater than r. The point of this is that a normal (say) 7-approximation to γ is also a normal 3-approximation to γ.

Remark 6.9. If (γ_0) is a normal $(0+)$-approximation to γ, and we put $\gamma_{>0} := \gamma_0^{-1}\gamma$, then, by Proposition 2.42 of [43], we have that $(\gamma_0, \gamma_{>0})$ is a topological Jordan decomposition of γ modulo $Z(\mathbf{G})^\circ$ (in the sense of Definition 2.23 of loc. cit.). Conversely, if $(\gamma_{\mathrm{as}}, \gamma_{\mathrm{tu}})$ is a topological Jordan decomposition of γ modulo $Z(\mathbf{G})^\circ$, and $\gamma_{\mathrm{tu}} \in G_{0+}$, then Lemma 2.18 of loc. cit. and Proposition 4.12 show that there is a point $x \in \mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma_{\mathrm{as}}), F)$ such that $((\gamma_{\mathrm{as}}), x)$ is a normal $(0+)$-approximation to γ.

If $\underline{\gamma} = (\gamma_i)_{0 \le i < r'}$ is a normal r-approximation to γ, then we will often write $\gamma_{<r}$ and $\gamma_{\ge r}$ for $\prod_{0 \le i < r} \gamma_i$ and $\gamma_{<r}^{-1}\gamma$, respectively. Of course, these depend on the choice of $\underline{\gamma}$, not just on γ. If we use these notations without explicit mention of $\underline{\gamma}$, then the choice of normal approximation will be irrelevant, or clear from the context.

Remark 6.10. Suppose that $\underline{\gamma} = (\gamma_i)_{0 \le i < r}$ is an r-approximation to an element $\gamma \in G$.

(1) For $0 \le i < r$, we have that $\gamma_i \in Z_G^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma})$; so also $\gamma_{<r} \in Z_G^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma})$.

(2) If $y \in \mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma}), F)$ and $0 \le i < r$, then $\gamma_i \in Z_G^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma})$ fixes the image of y in $\mathcal{B}^{\text{red}}(C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma}), F)$, hence acts by a translation on y. Since γ_i is bounded modulo $Z(G)$, it actually fixes the image of y in $\mathcal{B}^{\text{red}}(\mathbf{G}, F)$. That is, $\gamma_i \in \operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{y})$. Since $0 \le i < r$ was arbitrary, also $\gamma_{<r} \in \operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{y})$.

(3) Suppose that $y \in \mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma}), F)$, $\gamma_{\ge r} \in G_{y,r}$, and $k \in [\gamma; y, r]$. Then

$$[k, \gamma] \in G_{y,r}\,.$$

Indeed, $[k, \gamma]$ is the product of the $\gamma_{<i}$-conjugates of $[k, \gamma_i]$ (for $0 \le i < r$) with the $\gamma_{<r}$-conjugate of $[k, \gamma_{\ge r}]$. By Remark 6.10(2), $\gamma_{<r}$ and all $\gamma_{<i}$ lie in $\operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{y})$, so it suffices to show that $[k, \gamma_i], [k, \gamma_{\ge r}] \in G_{y,r}$ for all $0 \le i < r$. Since $k \in G_{y,0+}$, certainly $[k, \gamma_{\ge r}]$ lies in $G_{y,r}$ (even $G_{y,r+}$). For $0 \le i < r$, we have $k \in (C_G^{(i+)}(\underline{\gamma}), G)_{y,(0+,r-i)}$. Thus Lemma 5.32 (or Lemma 5.19, if $i = 0$) gives $[\gamma_i, k] \in (C_G^{(i+)}(\gamma), G)_{y,(i+,r)}$, and then Lemma 5.30 gives $[\gamma_i, k] \in G_{y,r}$.

Lemma 6.11. *The r-approximation $\underline{\gamma} = (\gamma_i)_{0 \le i < r'}$ to $\gamma \in G$ is normal if and only if γ commutes with γ_i for $0 \le i < r$.*

Proof. The ‘only if’ direction is obvious.

The ‘if’ direction is vacuous if $r = 0$, so suppose that $r > 0$. Put $\mathbf{H} := \bigcap_{0 \le i < r} C_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma_i)$. By Definition 6.8, there is $x \in \mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\gamma), F) = \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}, F)$ such that $\gamma_{\ge r} \in G_{x,r}$. On the other hand, since γ commutes with γ_i for each $0 \le i < r$, we have $\gamma_{\ge r} \in H$. By Corollary 4.8, $\mathbf{H}$ is a compatibly filtered F-subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$, so $H \cap G_{x,r} = H_{x,r}$. ☐

Remark 6.12. We will see later that every r-approximation to γ is conjugate to a normal r-approximation (Lemma 9.2). Moreover, we don’t have much freedom when choosing a normal r-approximation (Proposition 8.4).

Lemma 6.13. *Suppose* $\mathbf{T} \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ *is an* F*-torus,* $\gamma \in T$*, and* $\underline{\gamma} = (\gamma_i)_{0 \le i < r'}$ *is an* r*-approximation to* γ *such that* $\gamma_i \in T$ *for* $0 \le i < r$*. Then*

$$\left\{\alpha \in \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T}) \bigm| \operatorname{ord}(\alpha(\gamma) - 1) \ge r\right\} \\ = \bigcap_{0 \le i < r} \left\{\alpha \in \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T}) \bigm| \alpha(\gamma_i) = 1\right\}.$$

Proof. It is clear that the right-hand side is contained in the left. To prove the opposite containment, suppose there is some root α such that $\operatorname{ord}(\alpha(\gamma) - 1) \ge r$, but $\alpha(\gamma_i) \ne 1$ for some $0 \le i < r$. Let i_0 be the minimal such i. Then $\alpha(\gamma_{i_0})\alpha(\gamma)^{-1} = \left(\prod_{i_0 < i < r} \alpha(\gamma_i)\right)^{-1} \alpha(\gamma_{\ge r})^{-1}$, so $\operatorname{ord}(\alpha(\gamma_{i_0})\alpha(\gamma)^{-1} - 1) > i_0$. Note that, if E/F is the splitting field of $\mathbf{T}$, then $\gamma_{\ge r} \in G_r \cap T \subseteq \mathbf{G}(E)_r \cap \mathbf{T}(E) = \mathbf{T}(E)_r$ by Lemmata 3.9 and 3.8, so also $\operatorname{ord}(\alpha(\gamma_{\ge r}) - 1) \ge r > i_0$. Since

$$\Bigl(\prod_{0 \le j < i_0} \alpha(\gamma_j)^{-1}\Bigr)\Bigl(\prod_{i_0 < j < r} \alpha(\gamma_j)^{-1}\Bigr)\alpha(\gamma_{\ge r})^{-1} = \alpha(\gamma_{i_0})\alpha(\gamma)^{-1},$$

we have that $\operatorname{ord}(\alpha(\gamma_{i_0}) - 1) > i_0$. That $\gamma_{i_0} \in \mathcal{G}_{i_0}^G \cup \{1\}$ then implies that $\alpha(\gamma_{i_0}) = 1$, which is a contradiction. ☐

Corollary 6.14. *If* $\underline{\gamma} = (\gamma_i)_{0 \le i < r'}$ *is a normal* r*-approximation to* γ*, then* $C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma}) = C_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma_{<r})^\circ$*. If, further,* γ *is semisimple, then* $C_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma)^\circ \subseteq C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma})$*.*

Proof. We prove the second statement first. By Definition 6.8, $\gamma \in C_G^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma})$. In particular, there is a maximal F-torus $\mathbf{T} \subseteq C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma})$ such that $\gamma \in T$. Then $\gamma_i \in Z_G^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma}) \subseteq T$ for $0 \le i < r$. Now the result follows from Lemma 6.13, together with [45, §II.4.1(b)].

For the first statement, notice that the containment $C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma}) \subseteq C_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma_{<r})^\circ$ is clear. The reverse containment follows from the second statement, and the fact that $\underline{\gamma}$ is a normal r-approximation to the semisimple element $\gamma_{<r}$. ☐

7. GOOD ELEMENTS AND COMMUTATORS

Analogues of most of the results in this section are already known for good elements in Lie algebras. See [1, §2] and [22, §2].

In this section, let

- $d \in \mathbb{R}_{\ge 0}$,
- $\gamma_d \in \mathcal{G}_d^G$,
- $\mathbf{H} = C_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma_d)$,
- $\gamma_{>d} \in H_{d+}$, and
- $\gamma = \gamma_d \gamma_{>d}$.

Note that, by Corollary 4.8, $\mathbf{H}$ is a compatibly filtered F-subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$.

Lemma 7.1. *Suppose that* $g \in \mathbf{G}(F^{\mathrm{sep}})$ *and* ${}^g(\gamma_d H_{d+}) \cap \gamma_d H_{d+} \neq \emptyset$. *Then* $g \in \mathbf{H}(F^{\mathrm{sep}})$.

The proof is based on a communication from Stephen DeBacker.

Proof. Suppose that $h_1, h_2 \in H_{d+}$ are such that ${}^g(\gamma_d h_1) = \gamma_d h_2$. We claim that we may assume that h_1 and h_2 are semisimple.

By Lemma 3.2, there exists a complete subfield F' of F such that

- F/F' is unramified,
- $\mathbf{G}$ is defined over F', and
- $\gamma_d, h_1, h_2 \in \mathbf{G}(F')$.

Notice that it follows that $\mathbf{H} = C_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma_d)$ is defined over F'. By Lemma 3.9, we have $\gamma_d \in \mathcal{G}_d^{\mathbf{G}(F')}$ and $h_1, h_2 \in \mathbf{H}(F')_{d+}$. Since $F'^{\mathrm{sep}} = F^{\mathrm{sep}}$, we have that $g \in \mathbf{G}(F'^{\mathrm{sep}})$. Thus we may, and hence do, assume that F is complete. By another application of Lemma 3.9, we see that it is harmless to replace F by finite separable extensions, so we do so as necessary. In particular, we may, and hence do, assume that $g \in G$.

If $\operatorname{char} F = p > 0$, then let $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ be so large that $h_i^{p^n}$ is semisimple for $i = 1, 2$. Then

$$ {}^g(\gamma_d^{p^n} h_1^{p^n}) = \bigl({}^g(\gamma_d h_1)\bigr)^{p^n} = (\gamma_d h_2)^{p^n} = \gamma_d^{p^n} h_1^{p^n} \in {}^g(\gamma_d^{p^n} H_{d+}) \cap \gamma_d^{p^n} H_{d+}\,. $$

Certainly, $\gamma_d^{p^n} \in \mathcal{G}_d^G$. An easy GL_n calculation shows that $\mathbf{H} = C_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma_d^{p^n})$, so we may, and hence do, replace γ_d by $\gamma_d^{p^n}$ and h_i by $h_i^{p^n}$ (which is semisimple) for $i = 1, 2$.

If $\operatorname{char} F = 0$, then Lemma 3.7.18 of [3] shows that $\mathrm{d}_H(h_i)_{\mathrm{ss}} = \mathrm{d}_H(h_i) > d$ for $i = 1, 2$. In particular, we may, and hence do, replace h_i by $(h_i)_{\mathrm{ss}}$ for $i = 1, 2$.

In either case, for $i = 1, 2$, let $\mathbf{T}_i \subseteq \mathbf{H}$ be a maximal F-torus such that $h_i \in T_i$. Since $\gamma_d \in Z(H^\circ) \subseteq T_i$, also $\gamma_d h_i \in T_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. Upon enlarging F if necessary, we may, and hence do, assume that $\mathbf{T}_1$ and $\mathbf{T}_2$ are F-split. By Lemma 3.8, since $\mathbf{T}_2$ is an F-Levi subgroup of $\mathbf{H}$, we have that $H_{d+} \cap T_2 = (T_2)_{d+}$, so $h_2 \in (T_2)_{d+}$. Since $({}^g\gamma_d)$ is a normal $(d+)$-approximation to the semisimple element ${}^g(\gamma_d h_1)$, we have by Corollary 6.14 that $C_{\mathbf{G}}({}^g(\gamma_d h_1))^\circ \subseteq C_{\mathbf{G}}({}^g\gamma_d)^\circ$. In particular, $\mathbf{T}_2 \subseteq C_{\mathbf{G}}({}^g\gamma_d)^\circ$, so ${}^g\gamma_d \in Z(C_G({}^g\gamma_d)^\circ) \subseteq T_2$. Thus ${}^g h_1 \in T_2$. As above, we have that ${}^g h_1 \in (T_2)_{d+}$. Thus ${}^g\gamma_d = \gamma_d(h_2({}^g h_1)^{-1}) \in \gamma_d (T_2)_{d+}$. We now discard h_1, h_2, and $\mathbf{T}_1$, put $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{T}_2$, and simply remember for later use that ${}^g\gamma_d \equiv \gamma_d \pmod{T_{d+}}$.

Since $\gamma_d, {}^g\gamma_d \in T$, we have that $\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{T}^g \subseteq \mathbf{H}$, hence $\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{T}^g \subseteq \mathbf{H}^\circ$. Since both tori are maximal F-split in $\mathbf{H}^\circ$, there is $h \in H^\circ$ such that $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{T}^{gh}$, i.e., there is some element $w \in W(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$ that represents $(gh)^{-1}$. Then ${}^g\gamma_d = w^{-1}(\gamma_d)$.

Let $\mathbf{S}$ be the subtorus of $\mathbf{T}$ generated by the images of the w-fixed cocharacters of $\mathbf{T}$. Then any representative for w commutes with $\mathbf{S}$, so $w \in W(\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{T})$, where $\mathbf{M} = C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S})$. Let $V = \mathbf{X}_*(\mathbf{T}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}$, and denote by V^w and V_w the spaces of invariants and coinvariants, respectively, of V under w. Since the action of w on V is semisimple and $\mathbf{X}_*(\mathbf{T})$ is torsion free,

$$V = V^w \oplus V_w = (\mathbf{X}_*(\mathbf{T})^w \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}) \oplus V_w = (\mathbf{X}_*(\mathbf{S}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}) \oplus V_w\,.$$

Thus, if $\chi \in \mathbf{X}^*(\mathbf{T}/\mathbf{S}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}$ is w-fixed, then $\langle \chi, \lambda \rangle = 0$ for all $\lambda \in V$; i.e., $\chi = 0$.

Thus, for $\alpha \in \Phi(\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{T})$, $(w-1)^{-1}\alpha$ makes sense as an element of $\mathbf{X}^*(\mathbf{T}/\mathbf{S}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}$. Now let $\mathbf{J}$ be as in Hypothesis (C). By Proposition 14.2 of [7], the multiplication map $\mathbf{J}_{\text{ss}} \times Z(\mathbf{J})^\circ \longrightarrow \mathbf{J}$ is an F-isogeny, where $\mathbf{J}_{\text{ss}}$ is the derived group of $\mathbf{J}$. The preimage of $\mathbf{T} \subseteq \mathbf{J}$ under this map is contained in $(\mathbf{J}_{\text{ss}} \cap \mathbf{T}) \times Z(\mathbf{J})^\circ$. On the other hand, by Proposition 11.14(1) of [7], there is a maximal torus $\mathbf{T}'$ in $\mathbf{J}_{\text{ss}}$ such that $\mathbf{T}' \times Z(\mathbf{J})^\circ$ maps onto $\mathbf{T}$. Thus $\mathbf{T}' = (\mathbf{J}_{\text{ss}} \cap \mathbf{T})^\circ$; in particular, $\mathbf{T}'$ is defined over F, and w preserves $\mathbf{T}'$. Further, there are $z \in Z(\mathbf{J})^\circ(\overline{F})$ and $\gamma'_d \in \mathbf{T}'(\overline{F})$ such that $\gamma_d = \gamma'_d z$. By restriction, we may regard $(w-1)^{-1}\alpha$ as an element of $\mathbf{X}^*(\mathbf{T}') \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}$. Then, for all $\beta^\vee \in \Phi^\vee(\mathbf{J}_{\text{ss}}, \mathbf{T}')$,

$$\langle (w-1)^{-1}\alpha, \beta^\vee \rangle = \langle \alpha, (w-1)\beta^\vee \rangle = \langle \alpha, w\beta^\vee \rangle - \langle \alpha, \beta^\vee \rangle \in \mathbb{Z};$$

so $(w-1)^{-1}\alpha \in P(\mathbf{J}_{\text{ss}}, \mathbf{T}')$. Then $\chi := n(w-1)^{-1}\alpha$ belongs to $\mathbf{X}^*(\mathbf{T}')$, where n is the order of $P(\mathbf{J}_{\text{ss}}, \mathbf{T}')/\mathbf{X}^*(\mathbf{T}')$. Denote again by χ any extension of χ to $\mathbf{T}$. Now recall that

$$w^{-1}(\gamma_d) = {}^g\gamma_d \equiv \gamma_d \pmod{T_{d+}};$$

in particular, by the definition of the filtration on T, $\chi(w^{-1}(\gamma_d) \cdot \gamma_d^{-1}) \in F^\times_{d+}$. Thus

$$\alpha(\gamma_d)^n = \alpha(\gamma'_d)^n = (w-1)\chi(\gamma'_d) = \chi(w^{-1}(\gamma'_d) \cdot \gamma'^{-1}_d) = \chi(w^{-1}(\gamma_d) \cdot \gamma_d^{-1}) \in F^\times_{d+}\,.$$

By Hypothesis (C), n is not divisible by $\operatorname{char} \mathfrak{f}$, so we have that $\alpha(\gamma_d) \in F^\times_{d+}$. Since $\gamma_d \in \mathcal{G}^G_d \cup \{1\}$, in fact $\alpha(\gamma_d) = 1$. Since $\alpha \in \Phi(\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{T})$ was arbitrary, $\gamma_d \in Z(M)$. That is, ${}^g\gamma_d = w^{-1}(\gamma_d) = \gamma_d$, so $g \in \mathbf{H}(F^{\text{sep}})$. □

From now on, we assume Hypothesis (A), so that the results of §5.3 are available.

The next result is the analogue of Lemma 2.3.4 of [22]. The statement involves a concave function f satisfying some complicated conditions. Because we need it (or, rather, its consequence Lemma 7.4) in the proof of

Lemma 7.6, we must state the result in this generality; but, for most applications, we are only interested in the special cases described in Corollaries 7.3 and 7.5 below.

Lemma 7.2. *Let* $\mathbf{T}$ *be a maximal* F*-torus in* $\mathbf{H}$*, and* f *a positive,* $\operatorname{Gal}(F^{\text{sep}}/F)$*-invariant, concave function on* $\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{T})$*. Put*

$$f'(\alpha) = \begin{cases} f(\alpha), & \alpha \in \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{H},\mathbf{T}), \\ f(\alpha)+, & \alpha \notin \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{H},\mathbf{T}). \end{cases}$$

Suppose that

- $(\mathbf{T},\mathbf{H},\mathbf{G})$ *is a tame reductive* F*-sequence;*
- $x, y \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T}, F)$*;*
- $\gamma_{>d} \in H_{x,d} \cap H_{y,d+}$ *(or* $\operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x}) \cap H_{y,d+}$ *, if* $d = 0$*);*
- $f \vee f \geq f'$*;*
- $f \vee f' \geq f' + \varepsilon$ *for some* $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$*; and*
- *either*
  - $d = 0$ *and, for all discretely valued tame extensions* L/F*,* $\mathbf{H}(L) \cap \operatorname{stab}_{\mathbf{G}(L)}(\overline{x})$ *normalizes* ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f}$ *and* ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f'}$ *; or*
  - $d > 0$*,* $f \vee \overline{d} \geq f + d$*, and* $f' \vee \overline{d} \geq f' + d$*, where* $\overline{d}$ *is the function on* $\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{T})$ *which is constant with value* d *on* $\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{H},\mathbf{T})$*, and* ∞ *elsewhere.*

(Here, the operator $\vee$ *is as in Definition B.1.) Then the map* $g \mapsto [\gamma, g]$ *induces an isomorphism*

$$[\gamma, \cdot\,] \colon {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f:f'} \longrightarrow {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,(f+d):(f'+d)}.$$

Proof. Let $\mathbf{S}^\sharp$ be the maximal tame-modulo-$Z(\mathbf{G})^\circ$ F-torus in $\mathbf{T}$. Then $\mathbf{S}^\sharp$ is also a maximal tame-modulo-$Z(\mathbf{G})^\circ$ F-torus in $\mathbf{H}$ (and $\mathbf{G}$). Since $\gamma_d \in Z(H^\circ)$ is tame modulo $Z(\mathbf{G})^\circ$, we have by Lemma A.3 that $\gamma_d \in S^\sharp$. If $a(\gamma_d) = 1$ for all $a \in \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S}^\sharp)$, then $\alpha(\gamma_d) = 1$ for all $\alpha \in \Phi(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{T})$, so $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{G}$ and the result is trivial. Thus we may, and hence do, assume that there is some $a \in \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S}^\sharp)$ such that $a(\gamma_d) \neq 1$; but then there is $\alpha \in \Phi(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{T})$ such that $\alpha(\gamma_d) = a(\gamma_d) \neq 1$. Since $\gamma_d \in \mathcal{G}_d^G$, we have $\operatorname{ord}(\alpha(\gamma_d) - 1) = d$. Let L/F be a discretely valued tame extension such that $\mathbf{H}$ and $\mathbf{G}$ are L-quasisplit, and the image of $\mathbf{S}^\sharp$ in $\widetilde{\mathbf{G}}$ is L-split. Then $a(\gamma_d) \in L^\times$, so $d \in \operatorname{ord}(L^\times)$.

By hypothesis and Lemma 5.17, the conditions of Corollary 5.26 are satisfied for f. It is easy to verify that they are also satisfied for $f + d$.

Therefore, by §3.3 and Corollary 5.26, for $h = f$ and $h = f + d$,

$$(*)\qquad \begin{aligned} {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,h:h'} &\cong \prod_{a \in \Phi(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{S}^\sharp) \smallsetminus \Phi(\mathbf{H},\mathbf{S}^\sharp)} U_{(a+h(a)):(a+h(a))+} \\ &\cong \prod_{a \in \Phi(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{S}^\sharp) \smallsetminus \Phi(\mathbf{H},\mathbf{S}^\sharp)} (L_{\alpha(a)})_{h(a):h(a)+}\,. \end{aligned}$$

Here, we have chosen (arbitrarily), for each L-root a, an F^{sep}-root $\alpha(a)$ restricting to it; denoted by L_α the fixed field in F^{sep} of $\operatorname{stab}_{\operatorname{Gal}(F^{\mathrm{sep}}/L)} \alpha$, for $\alpha \in \Phi(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{T})$; written $h' = f'$ if $h = f$ and $h' = f' + d$ if $h = f + d$; and, as usual, used, for any L-root a, the shorthand $a + k$ to denote the unique affine L-root φ with gradient a such that $\varphi(x) = k$. (Really, the product should have been over $\Phi(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{S}'^\sharp)$, where $\mathbf{S}'^\sharp$ is the maximal L-split torus in $\mathbf{T}$; but, by Lemma A.1, we have that $\mathbf{S}^\sharp = Z(\mathbf{G})^\circ \cdot \mathbf{S}'^\sharp$, so the restriction map $\Phi(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{S}^\sharp) \longrightarrow \Phi(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{S}'^\sharp)$ is a bijection.)

We will denote by $[\gamma_d, \cdot\,]_L$ the map

$${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f:f'} \longrightarrow {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,(f+d):(f'+d)}$$

induced by taking commutators with γ_d. Note that this map is well defined, and a homomorphism. Similar notation (such as $[\gamma, \cdot\,]_L$) will be used, without further explanation, as necessary.

By §3.3, since $\gamma_d \in \mathbf{T}(L)$, the map

$$\prod_{a \in \Phi(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{S}^\sharp) \smallsetminus \Phi(\mathbf{H},\mathbf{S}^\sharp)} (L_{\alpha(a)})_{f(a):f(a)+} \longrightarrow \prod_{a \in \Phi(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{S}^\sharp) \smallsetminus \Phi(\mathbf{H},\mathbf{S}^\sharp)} (L_{\alpha(a)})_{(f(a)+d):(f(a)+d)+}$$

induced (via the isomorphisms in (∗) for $h = f$ and $h = f + d$) by $[\gamma_d, \cdot\,]_L$ is

$$(t_a)_a \mapsto ((a(\gamma_d) - 1)t_a)_a.$$

Since $\gamma_d \in \mathcal{G}_d^G$, we have that $\operatorname{ord}(a(\gamma_d) - 1) = d$ for $a \in \Phi(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{S}^\sharp) \smallsetminus \Phi(\mathbf{H},\mathbf{S}^\sharp)$, so $[\gamma_d, \cdot\,]_L$ is an isomorphism.

Our next step is to show that $[\gamma, \cdot\,]_L$ is an isomorphism. For the remainder of this proof, it will be convenient to do many of our calculations in the $\mathfrak{f}$-algebra $\mathcal{E}$ of endomorphisms of the finite-dimensional $\mathfrak{f}$-vector space $V := {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f:f'}$ or the $\mathfrak{f}$-vector space $\mathcal{E}'$ of homomorphisms $V \longrightarrow {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,(f+d):(f'+d)}$.

First, suppose $d = 0$. Then $[\gamma, \cdot\,]_L \in \mathcal{E}$. As elements of $\mathcal{E}$,

$$\begin{aligned} [\gamma, \cdot\,]_L &= \operatorname{Int}(\gamma) - 1 \\ &= (\operatorname{Int}(\gamma_0) - 1) + \operatorname{Int}(\gamma_0)(\operatorname{Int}(\gamma_{>0}) - 1) \\ &= [\gamma_0, \cdot\,]_L + \operatorname{Int}(\gamma_0)(\operatorname{Int}(\gamma_{>0}) - 1). \end{aligned}$$

Note that the summands commute, and the first summand is an isomorphism. Recall that $\gamma_{>0}$ acts simplicially on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F) = \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{red}}(\mathbf{G}, F) \times$

$V_F(Z(\mathbf{G}))$. Since $\gamma_{>0} \in H_{y,0+} \subseteq \operatorname{stab}_G(y)$, the action on the second factor is trivial. Since $\gamma_{>0}$ fixes $\overline{x}$ by assumption, it fixes $x \in \{\overline{x}\} \times V_F(Z(\mathbf{G}))$. By Lemma 3.11, $\gamma_{>0} \in H_{x,0}$. By Lemma 3.10, the image of $\gamma_{>0}$ in $(\mathsf{H}_x^L)^\circ(\mathfrak{f}_L)$ is unipotent. Since Int affords an algebraic representation of the $\overline{\mathfrak{f}}_L$-group $(\mathsf{H}_x^L)^\circ$ in the $\overline{\mathfrak{f}}_L$-vector space in the $V \otimes_{\mathfrak{f}_L} \overline{\mathfrak{f}}_L$, we have that $\operatorname{Int}(\gamma_{>0}) - 1$ is a nilpotent operator on V. Therefore, $[\gamma, \cdot\,]_L$ is an isomorphism.

Now suppose $d > 0$. Recall that $\overline{d}$ is the function on $\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$ which is constant with value d on $\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{T})$, and ∞ elsewhere. Since

$$(f + d) \vee \overline{d} \geq (f \vee \overline{d}) + d \geq f + 2d > f' + d,$$

we have by Lemma 5.17 that

$$[\gamma, \cdot\,]_L = [\gamma_d, \cdot\,]_L + \operatorname{Int}(\gamma_d)[\gamma_{>d}, \cdot\,]_L = [\gamma_d, \cdot\,]_L + [\gamma_{>d}, \cdot\,]_L$$

in $\mathcal{E}'$. Further, $[\gamma_d, \cdot\,]_L = \operatorname{Int}(\gamma_d) - 1$ and $[\gamma_{>d}, \cdot\,]_L = \operatorname{Int}(\gamma_{>d}) - 1$ in $\mathcal{E}'$.

By Lemmata 3.9 and 3.10, there exist a parabolic L-subgroup $\mathbf{P}$ of $\mathbf{H}$ containing $\mathbf{S}^\sharp$ and an element $u \in R_{\mathrm{un}}(\mathbf{P})(L)$ such that $\gamma_{>d} \in u\mathbf{H}(L)_{x,d+}$. By Proposition 6.4.9 of [12], since $u \in \mathbf{H}(L)_{x,d}$, there are elements $u_a \in U_{a+d}$ for $a \in \Phi(R_{\mathrm{un}}(\mathbf{P}), \mathbf{S}^\sharp)$ such that $u = \prod_a u_a$. We have that $[\gamma_{>d}, \cdot\,]_L = \sum_a [u_a, \cdot\,]_L$ in $\mathcal{E}'$. We claim that the element $\mathcal{T} := \sum_a [\gamma_d, \cdot\,]_L^{-1} \circ [u_a, \cdot\,]_L$ of $\mathcal{E}$ is nilpotent. Choose a basis of $\Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S}^\sharp)$ with respect to which the elements of $\Phi(R_{\mathrm{un}}(\mathbf{P}), \mathbf{S}^\sharp)$ are positive, and denote by ht the associated height function. For $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, denote by V_i the subgroup of ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f:f'}$ generated by the images there of the affine root subgroups $U_{b+f(b)}$ with $b \in \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S}^\sharp) \smallsetminus \Phi(\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{S}^\sharp)$ and $\operatorname{ht}(b) \geq i$. Note that, for i sufficiently large, $V_i = \{0\}$ and $V_{-i} = V$.

Fix $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $a \in \Phi(R_{\mathrm{un}}(\mathbf{P}), \mathbf{S}^\sharp)$, and suppose that $b \in \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S}^\sharp) \smallsetminus \Phi(\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{S}^\sharp)$ satisfies $\operatorname{ht}(b) \geq i$.

Notice that $a \in \Phi(\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{S}^\sharp)$, so $b \neq -a$. Since the collection of restrictions of d_x to the root groups is a *valuation de la donné radicielle*, in the language of [12, §6.2], Définition 6.2.1(V3) of loc. cit. implies that

$$[u_a, U_{b+f(b)}] \subseteq \prod U_{(ma+nb)+(md+nf(b))}\,,$$

the product taken over all $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. If $m > 1$ or $n > 1$, then

$$U_{(ma+nb)+(md+nf(b))} \subseteq {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,(f+d)+} \subseteq {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f'+d}\,,$$

so the image of $[u_a, U_{b+f(b)}]$ in ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,(f+d):(f'+d)}$ is contained in the image there of $U_{(a+b)+(d+f(b))}$. One sees as above that the preimage under $[\gamma_d, \cdot\,]_L$ of $U_{(a+b)+(d+f(b))}$ in the latter case is precisely $U_{(a+b)+f(b)}$. Since $\operatorname{ht}(a+b) > i$, we have (whether or not $a + b \in \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S}^\sharp)$) that $[\gamma_d, \cdot\,]_L^{-1} \circ [u_a, \cdot\,]_L$ carries the image in V of $U_{b+f(b)}$ into V_{i+1}.

Since $b \in \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S}^\sharp) \smallsetminus \Phi(\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{S}^\sharp)$ was arbitrary, we have that $\mathcal{T}$ carries V_i into V_{i+1} for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, hence is nilpotent. Thus $1 + \mathcal{T}$ is an isomorphism;

so

$$[\gamma, \cdot\,]_L = [\gamma_d, \cdot\,]_L \circ (1 + \mathcal{T})$$

is also.

Finally, we perform tame descent by reduction to the complete case. Suppose that F' and L' are complete subfields of F and L, respectively, such that

- F/F' and L/L' are unramified,
- $\mathbf{H}$ and $\mathbf{G}$ are defined over F' and quasisplit over L',
- $\mathbf{S}^\sharp$ is L'-split, and
- $x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T}, F')$.

We replace L' by its Galois closure over F', then F' by the intersection of L' and F. Then we have the following additional conditions.

- L'/F' is tame and Galois,
- $F' = L' \cap F$, and
- f is $\operatorname{Gal}(L'/F')$-invariant.

By Lemma 5.33 and Proposition 5.39, for $h = f$ and $h = f + d$,

$${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L')_{x,h:h'}^{\operatorname{Gal}(L'/F')} = {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L')_{x,h}^{\operatorname{Gal}(L'/F')} / {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L')_{x,h'}^{\operatorname{Gal}(L'/F')} = {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(F')_{x,h:h'}\,,$$

which is contained in ${}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,h:h'}$. By Lemma 3.2, ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,h:h'}^{\operatorname{Gal}(L/F)} = \varinjlim {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L')_{x,h:h'}^{\operatorname{Gal}(L'/F')}$, the limit taken over pairs (L', F') satisfying all the above conditions; so ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,h:h'}^{\operatorname{Gal}(L/F)} \subseteq {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,h:h'}$. The reverse containment, hence equality, is easy. Since $[\gamma, \cdot\,]_L$ is $\operatorname{Gal}(L/F)$-equivariant, $[\gamma, \cdot\,]_F$ is an isomorphism, as desired. ☐

Corollary 7.3. *Suppose that* $\gamma_{>d} \in H_{x,d} \cap H_{d+}$. *For* $r \in \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{>0}$, *the map* $g \mapsto [\gamma, g]$ *induces an isomorphism*

$$[\gamma, \cdot\,] : (H, G)_{x,(r,r):(r,r+)} \longrightarrow (H, G)_{x,(r+d,r+d):(r+d,(r+d)+)}.$$

Proof. Note that the domain and codomain of $[\gamma, \cdot\,]$ are both trivial if $r = s+$ for some $s \in \mathbb{R}$, or if $r = \infty$; so we assume that $r \in \mathbb{R}$.

Let y be any point of $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}, F)$ such that $\gamma_{>d} \in H_{y,d+}$, and let $\mathbf{T}$ be a maximal F-torus in $\mathbf{H}$ such that $(\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{H})$ is a tame reductive F-sequence and $x, y \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T}, F)$. (To see that such a torus $\mathbf{T}$ exists, let $\mathbf{S}$ be any maximal F-split torus such that $x, y \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$. By Lemma 4.5, there is a maximal F^{tr}-split torus $\mathbf{S}^\sharp$, defined over F, containing $\mathbf{S}$. Then we may take $\mathbf{T}$ to be $C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S}^\sharp)$.) Let f be the constant function on $\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$ with value r. Note that ${}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f} = G_{x,r} = (H, G)_{x,(r,r)}$ and ${}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f'} = (H, G)_{x,(r,r+)}$, where f' is as in Lemma 7.2, and similarly with $f + d$ and $f' + d$ in place of f and f', respectively. Thus it suffices to show that the hypotheses of Lemma 7.2 are satisfied.

We have that $f \vee f$ is the constant function with value $2r \geq r+$, so $f \vee f \geq f'$; and $f \vee f'$ is constant with value $2r \geq r$ on $\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{T})$, and takes the value $2r+$ elsewhere, so $f \vee f' \geq f' + r$. If $d > 0$, and we define $\overline{d}$ as in Lemma 7.2, then a similar calculation shows that $f \vee \overline{d} = f + \overline{d} \geq f + d$ and $f' \vee \overline{d} = f' + \overline{d} \geq f' + d$. If $d = 0$, then Lemma 5.19 gives that $\mathbf{H}(L) \cap \operatorname{stab}_{\mathbf{G}(L)}(\overline{x})$ normalizes both ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f} = \mathbf{G}(L)_{x,r}$ and ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f'} = (\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{G})(L)_{x,(r,r+)}$. □

The next result is the analogue of Corollary 2.3.5 of [22].

Lemma 7.4. *With the notation and bulleted hypotheses of Lemma 7.2, suppose further that*

- $f \vee f \geq f + (0+)$*; and*
- *either*
  - $d = 0$ *and, for all discretely valued tame extensions* L/F *and all* $t \in \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{\geq 0}$, $\mathbf{H}(L) \cap \operatorname{stab}_{\mathbf{G}(L)}(\overline{x})$ *normalizes* ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f+t}$ *and* ${}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{x,f'+t}$*; or*
  - $d > 0$.

Then the ${}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f}$*-orbit of* $\gamma \cdot {}_{\mathbf{T}}H_{x,f+d}$ *is* $\gamma \cdot {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f+d}$.

Proof. We have $\gamma \cdot {}_{\mathbf{T}}H_{x,f+d} \subseteq H_{x,d}$ (or $H \cap \operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x})$, if $d = 0$). Since the commutator of $H_{x,d}$ (or $H \cap \operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x})$, if $d = 0$) and ${}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f}$ lies in ${}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f+d}$, we have that the ${}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f}$-orbit of $\gamma \cdot {}_{\mathbf{T}}H_{x,f+d}$ is contained in $\gamma \cdot {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f+d}$. Thus we need only show that every element of $\gamma \cdot {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f+d}$ is ${}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f}$-conjugate to an element of $\gamma \cdot {}_{\mathbf{T}}H_{x,f+d}$. By Lemma 3.2, given any such element, we may find a complete subfield of F over which that element is defined, and of which F is an unramified extension. Upon replacing F by this complete subfield, we may, and hence do, assume that F is complete.

For $t \in \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{\geq 0}$ and $\alpha \in \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$, put

$$f'_t(\alpha) = \begin{cases} f(\alpha), & \alpha \in \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{T}), \\ f(\alpha) + t, & \alpha \notin \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{T}). \end{cases}$$

(Thus, in the notation of Lemma 7.2, $f' = f'_{0+}$.) By Lemma 5.29,

$$\bigcap_{t \geq 0} {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f'_t+d} = {}_{\mathbf{T}}H_{x,f+d}\,.$$

Thus, it suffices to prove that, for any $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, any element of $\gamma \cdot {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f'_t+d}$ is conjugate by ${}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f+t}$ to an element of $\gamma \cdot {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f'_{t+}+d}$.

Choose $\delta \in {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f'_t+d}$. By Proposition 5.40, we have

$${}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f'_t+d} = {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f+t+d} \cdot {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f'_{t+}+d}\,.$$

In particular, ${}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f'_{t+}+d} \cdot \delta^{-1}$ contains an element of ${}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f+t+d}$, say δ'. Note that $f + t$ satisfies the conditions of Lemma 7.2, so there is an element

$g \in {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f+t}$ such that

$$[\gamma^{-1}, g] \in {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f'+(t+d)} \cdot \delta' \subseteq {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f'_{t+}+d} \cdot \delta'.$$

In particular, $[\gamma^{-1}, g] \in {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f'_{t+}+d} \cdot \delta^{-1}$. Since

$$(f'_t + d) \vee (f + t) \geq (f \vee f) + (t + d) \geq f + (t + d)+ \geq f'_{t+} + d$$

by our hypothesis on f, Lemma 5.17 gives $[\delta^{-1}, g] \in {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f'_{t+}+d}$. Thus

$$^{g}(\gamma\delta) = \gamma \cdot [\gamma^{-1}, g]\delta \cdot [\delta^{-1}, g] \in \gamma \cdot {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f'_{t+}+d}. \quad \square$$

Corollary 7.5. *Suppose that* $\gamma_{>d} \in H_{x,d} \cap H_{d+}$ *(or* $\operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x}) \cap H_{d+}$*, if* $d = 0$*). For any* $r \in \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{>0}$*, the* $G_{x,r}$*-orbit of* $\gamma H_{x,r+d}$ *is* $\gamma G_{x,r+d}$*.*

Proof. This corollary follows from Corollary 7.3 in exactly the same way as Lemma 7.4 follows from Lemma 7.2. $\square$

The next result is the analogue of Lemma 2.3.3 of [22]. Corollary 4.4.3 of [17] is a similar result.

Lemma 7.6. *Let* $x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F)$*. If* $d = 0$ *and* $\gamma \in \operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x})$*, or* $d > 0$ *and* $\gamma \in G_{x,d}$*, then* $x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}, F)$*.*

Proof. If $d = 0$, then, by Proposition 4.12, we have $\overline{x} \in \mathcal{B}(C_{\widetilde{\mathbf{G}}}(\overline{\gamma}_0), F) = \mathcal{B}(C_{\widetilde{\mathbf{G}}}(\overline{\gamma}_0)^\circ, F)$. By Proposition 9.6 of [7],

$$C_{\widetilde{\mathbf{G}}}(\overline{\gamma}_0)^\circ = C_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma_0)^\circ / Z(\mathbf{G})^\circ = \mathbf{H}^\circ / Z(\mathbf{G})^\circ.$$

Thus, $\overline{x} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}^\circ/Z(\mathbf{G})^\circ, F) \subseteq \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{red}}(\mathbf{G}, F)$. Since the preimage in $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F)$ of $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}^\circ/Z(\mathbf{G})^\circ, F)$ is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}^\circ, F)$, we have that $x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}^\circ, F) = \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}, F)$.

Now suppose that $d > 0$. By Hypothesis (B), $\mathbf{H}^\circ$ is a Levi subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$. Let L/F be a discretely valued separable extension such that $\mathbf{H}$, hence also $\mathbf{G}$, is L-split. Then $\mathbf{H}^\circ$ is an L-Levi subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$. Moreover, since γ_d lies in any L-split maximal torus of $\mathbf{H}$, we have that $d = \mathrm{d}(\gamma_d) \in \operatorname{ord}(L^\times)$. Let $\mathbf{P}$ be a parabolic L-subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$ with Levi component $\mathbf{H}^\circ$, and $\mathbf{P}'$ its opposite parabolic (with respect to any maximal torus in $\mathbf{H}^\circ$). Let $\mathbf{U}$ and $\mathbf{U}'$ be the unipotent radicals of $\mathbf{P}$ and $\mathbf{P}'$, respectively. Put

$$\mathcal{B}(\gamma) = \bigl\{ y \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, L) \bigm| \gamma \in \mathbf{G}(L)_{y,d} \bigr\}.$$

If $\mathcal{B}(\gamma) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}, L)$, then Lemma 4.10 gives $x \in \mathcal{B}(\gamma) \cap \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}, F)$, and we are done. Otherwise, we claim that that $\mathcal{B}(\gamma)$ is convex chamber closed in the sense of [27, §3.1].

Indeed, it is clear that $\mathcal{B}(\gamma)$ is closed, convex, and the union of closures of facets. By Lemma 3.9, $H_{d+} \subseteq \mathbf{H}(L)_{d+}$, so $\gamma \in \gamma_d \mathbf{H}(L)_{d+}$. Thus there is some chamber $C_0 \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}, L)$ so that $\gamma \in \gamma_d \mathbf{H}(L)_{x,d+}$ for all $x \in C_0$. By Lemma 3.12, $\gamma_d \in \mathbf{H}(L)_{x,d}$ for all $x \in C_0$, so $C_0 \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\gamma)$. If J is a facet in $\mathcal{B}(\gamma)$, then there is an apartment $\mathcal{A}$ containing both C_0 and J, hence the convex hull of C_0 and J. Since $\mathcal{A}$ is a Euclidean space, we know that the convex hull of C_0 and J, hence $\mathcal{B}(\gamma)$, contains a chamber C' of $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, L)$ such that $J \subseteq \overline{C}\,'$. That is, $\mathcal{B}(\gamma)$ is a union of closures of chambers.

Thus there is a chamber $C \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\gamma)$ such that $C \cap \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}, L) = \emptyset$ and $\overline{C} \cap \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}, L)$ contains a facet J of C of codimension 1. Fix $y \in J$. By Lemma 2.4.1 of [3], there is $u \in \mathbf{U}(L) \cap \mathbf{G}(L)_y$ such that $uC \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}, L)$. Note that the closure of uC includes $uy = y$. Fix $z \in C$. By Theorem 4.2 of [29], since $uz \in uC \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}, L)$, the preimage of $\mathbf{G}(L)_{uz,d}$ under the multiplication map

$$\mathbf{U}'(L) \times \mathbf{H}^\circ(L) \times \mathbf{U}(L) \longrightarrow \mathbf{G}(L)$$

is

$$(\mathbf{U}'(L) \cap \mathbf{G}(L)_{uz,d}) \times \mathbf{H}(L)_{uz,d} \times (\mathbf{U}(L) \cap \mathbf{G}(L)_{uz,d}).$$

Since $z \in C \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\gamma)$, we have that $\gamma \in \mathbf{G}(L)_{z,d}$, so $\gamma \cdot [\gamma^{-1}, u] = {}^u\gamma \in \mathbf{G}(L)_{uz,d}$. Since $\gamma \in \mathbf{H}^\circ(L)$ and $[\gamma^{-1}, u] \in \mathbf{U}(L)$, in fact $\gamma \in \mathbf{H}(L)_{uz,d}$ and $[\gamma^{-1}, u] \in \mathbf{U}(L) \cap \mathbf{G}(L)_{uz,d}$. By Lemma 3.10, $[\gamma^{-1}, u] \in \mathbf{U}(L) \cap \mathbf{G}(L)_{w,d+}$ for some point w near uz. In particular, we may choose w to lie in uC. Since $d \in \operatorname{ord}(L^\times)$, we have that $\mathbf{G}(L)_{w,d+} = \mathbf{G}(L)_{uz,d+}$, so $[\gamma^{-1}, u] \in \mathbf{U}(L) \cap \mathbf{G}(L)_{uz,d+}$.

That is, ${}^u\gamma \in \gamma(\mathbf{U}(L) \cap \mathbf{G}(L)_{uz,d+}) = \gamma \cdot {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{uz,f+d}$, where $\mathbf{T}$ is an L-torus in $\mathbf{H}$ of maximal F^{tr}-split rank, and f is the function on $\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$ which is ε on $\Phi(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{T})$ and ∞ elsewhere (for some suitably small $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$). By Lemma 7.4, there is $k \in {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{uz,f}$ such that ${}^{ku}\gamma \in \gamma \cdot {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{H}(L)_{uz,f+d} = \{\gamma\} \subseteq \gamma_d \mathbf{H}(L)_{d+}$. Since $ku \in \mathbf{U}(L)$, there is a one-parameter subgroup $\lambda \in \mathbf{X}_*(Z(\mathbf{H}^\circ))$ such that $\lim_{t \longrightarrow \infty} {}^{\lambda(t)}(ku) = 1$. On the other hand, by Lemma 7.1, $ku \in \mathbf{H}(L)$; so $\lim_{t \longrightarrow \infty} {}^{\lambda(t)}(ku) \equiv ku \pmod{\mathbf{H}^\circ(L)}$. Thus $ku \in \mathbf{H}^\circ(L) \cap \mathbf{U}(L) = \{1\}$, so $u = k^{-1} \in {}_{\mathbf{T}}\mathbf{G}(L)_{uz,f} \subseteq \operatorname{stab}_G(uz)$. In particular, $z = u^{-1}(uz) = uz \in C \cap uC \subseteq C \cap \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}, L) = \emptyset$, which is a contradiction. $\square$

8. EXISTENCE AND UNIQUENESS OF NORMAL APPROXIMATIONS

We now discard the notation d, γ, γ_d, and $\mathbf{H}$ of the preceding section. Fix $\gamma \in G$ and $r \in \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{\geq 0}$.

In this section, we show that normal approximations often exist. When they exist, they are essentially unique.

Lemma 8.1. *Suppose that*

- $(\mathbf{G}', \mathbf{G})$ *is a tame reductive* F*-sequence;*
- $d \in \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{\geq 0}$*;*
- $d > 0$ *or* $\widetilde{G}_{0+}$ *is contained in the image of* G_{0+}*;*
- γ *is bounded modulo* $Z(G)$*; and*

- *γ has a normal d-approximation $(\gamma_i)_{0\le i<d}$ with $\gamma_i \in G'$ for $0 \le i < d$.*

*If there is a maximal tame-modulo-center (of $\mathbf{G}$) F-torus $\mathbf{S} \subseteq C^{(d)}_{\mathbf{G}'}(\gamma)$, satisfying property (**Gd**^{G}), such that $\gamma \in S$, then $\gamma_i \in S$ for $0 \le i < d$, and there are elements $\gamma_i \in S$ for $d \le i < r$ such that $(\gamma_i)_{0\le i<r}$ is a normal r-approximation to γ.*

The hypothesis that γ is bounded modulo $Z(G)$ is redundant if $d > 0$. If $d = 0$, the existence of a normal d-approximation is vacuous.

The point of this result is to show that normal approximations exist in abundance. Since it is not much additional work, we show that we may find normal approximations in G and G' simultaneously.

Proof. If the result holds (with d fixed) for all r' sufficiently close to r, then taking the union of successively larger r'-approximations gives the result for r. Thus the set of all r for which the result holds is order-closed. Further, if the result holds for the pair (d, r), then it holds for the pair $(d, r+)$ if and only if it holds for the pair $(r, r+)$. Finally, since a normal $(r+)$-approximation is precisely a normal $(r+\varepsilon)$-approximation for $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ sufficiently small, the result holds for the pair $(d, r+)$ if and only if it holds for all pairs $(d, r+\varepsilon)$ with $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ sufficiently small. Thus, if we can show the result for all pairs $(d, d+)$, then we will have shown that (with d fixed) the set of all r for which the result holds is also order-open, hence consists of all $r \in \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}$. That is, we may, and hence do, suppose throughout that $r = d+$.

By Corollary A.2, $\mathbf{T} := C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S})$ is an E-Levi F-subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$, where E/F is the splitting field of $\mathbf{S}/Z(\mathbf{G})^\circ$. It is also a maximal torus in $\mathbf{G}$.

Suppose $d = 0$. By Proposition 2.36 of [43], $\overline{\gamma}$ has a topological Jordan decomposition $\overline{\gamma} = \overline{\gamma}_{\mathrm{as}}\overline{\gamma}_{\mathrm{tu}}$ (in the sense of Definition 2.23 of loc. cit.). In particular, $\overline{\gamma}_{\mathrm{as}}$ belongs to a torus containing $\overline{\gamma} = \overline{\gamma}_{\mathrm{ss}}$, hence, by Lemma 2.25 of loc. cit., to every maximal such torus — in particular, to the image in $\widetilde{\mathbf{G}}$ of $\mathbf{T}$. By Proposition 2.43 of loc. cit., we have that $\overline{\gamma}_{\mathrm{tu}} \in \widetilde{G}_{0+}$; so, by hypothesis, $\overline{\gamma}_{\mathrm{tu}}$ has a preimage $\gamma_{>0} \in G_{0+}$. Put $\gamma_0 = \gamma\gamma_{>0}^{-1}$. Then $(\gamma_0)^{-} = \overline{\gamma}_{\mathrm{as}}$ belongs to the image in $\widetilde{G}$ of T, so $\gamma_0 \in Z(G)T = T$, hence also $\gamma_{>0} \in T$. By Corollary 2.37 of loc. cit., $(\gamma_0)^{-}$ is tame, i.e., γ_0 is tame modulo center in $\mathbf{G}$. By Lemma A.11, γ_0 remains tame modulo $Z(\mathbf{G})$ in $\mathbf{T}$, hence belongs to S, the (set of F-rational points of the) maximal tame-modulo-$Z(\mathbf{G})$ torus in $\mathbf{T}$. By Lemmata 3.9, 3.8, and 3.7, we have $\gamma_{>0} \in T_{0+} \subseteq G_{x,0+}$ for any $x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T}, F) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma_0), F)$. Thus, (γ_0) is a normal $(0+)$-approximation to γ.

Now suppose $d > 0$. By Definitions 6.1 and 6.8, γ_i belongs to a tame-modulo-center F-torus in $C^{(d)}_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma)$ for $0 \le i < d$. By Remark 6.10(1), $\gamma_i \in$

$Z_G^{(d)}(\gamma)$ for $0 \le i < d$. Since $\mathbf{S}$ is a maximal tame-modulo-center F-torus in $C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(d)}(\gamma)$, we have by Lemma A.3 that $\gamma_i \in S$ for $0 \le i < d$. Thus $\gamma_{\ge d} \in S$, and we may, and hence do, replace $\mathbf{G}'$ by $C_{\mathbf{G}'}^{(d)}(\gamma)$. Since $\gamma_{\ge d} \in G_d$, we have by Lemma 3.9 that $\gamma_{\ge d} \in \mathbf{G}(E)_d$, hence by Lemma 3.8 that $\gamma_{\ge d} \in \mathbf{T}(E)_d$. By Lemma 2.4 of [33], we have $\mathbf{S}(E)_0 \subseteq \mathbf{T}(E)_0$. By the definition of the filtration on $\mathbf{S}(E)$, we have that $\mathbf{S}(E) \cap \mathbf{T}(E)_d = \mathbf{S}(E)_0 \cap \mathbf{T}(E)_d = \mathbf{S}(E)_d$; in particular, $\gamma_{\ge d} \in \mathbf{S}(E)_d$. By Lemma 3.7, $\gamma_{\ge d} \in S_d$. By property (**Gd**^{G}), there is an element $\gamma_d \in \gamma_{\ge d} S_{d+} \cap (\mathcal{G}_d^G \cup \{1\})$. Put $\underline{\gamma} = (\gamma_i)_{0 \le i \le d}$ and choose $x \in \mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}'}(\mathbf{S}), F) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}'}^{(d+)}(\underline{\gamma}), F)$. Then $\left(\prod_{0 \le i \le d} \gamma_i\right)^{-1}\gamma \in S_{d+}$, and reasoning as above shows that $S_{d+} \subseteq G'_{x,d+} \subseteq G_{x,d+}$. That is, $\underline{\gamma}$ is a $(d+)$-approximation to γ. Since $\gamma_i \in S$ for $0 \le i \le d$, we have that $\gamma \in S \subseteq C_G^{(d+)}(\underline{\gamma})$, so $\underline{\gamma}$ is a *normal* $(d+)$-approximation to γ. $\square$

In Lemma 8.1, we showed that, if $(\mathbf{G}', \mathbf{G})$ is a tame reductive F-sequence, then some normal approximation in G is also a normal approximation in G'. The next result shows that, if $(\mathbf{G}', \mathbf{G})$ is a tame *Levi* F-sequence, then any normal approximation in G is already also a normal approximation in G'.

Recall that $r \in \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{\ge 0}$.

Lemma 8.2. *Suppose that*

- $(\mathbf{G}', \mathbf{G})$ *is a tame Levi F-sequence,*
- $\gamma \in G'$,
- $\underline{\gamma} = (\gamma_i)_{0 \le i < r}$ *is a normal r-approximation to γ in G, and*
- $r \le 0+$, *γ is semisimple, or* $\gamma_{<r} \in G'$.

Then $\underline{\gamma}$ is a normal r-approximation to γ in G', and

$$\left\{x \in \mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\gamma), F) \;\middle|\; \gamma_{\ge r} \in G_{x,r}\right\} \cap \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}', F) = \left\{x \in \mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}'}^{(r)}(\gamma), F) \;\middle|\; \gamma_{\ge r} \in G'_{x,r}\right\}.$$

Proof. We may, and hence do, assume that $r > 0$ (since otherwise the statement is vacuous). To show that $\underline{\gamma}$ is a normal r-approximation to γ in G', we need to show two things:

1. that it is a good sequence in G' (i.e., that there exists a tame-modulo-center F-torus in $\mathbf{G}'$ containing all the γ_i); and then
2. that $\gamma_{\ge r} \in C_{\mathbf{G}'}^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma})_r$.

Suppose that $\gamma_{<r} \in G'$. Then also $\gamma_{\ge r} = \gamma_{<r}^{-1}\gamma \in G'$. By Corollary 6.14, $Z_G^{(r)}(\gamma) = Z(C_G(\gamma_{<r})^\circ) \subseteq G'$. By Remark 6.10(1), $\gamma_i \in Z_G^{(r)}(\gamma) \subseteq G'$ for all $0 \le i < r$. Since there is a tame F-torus in $\mathbf{G}$ containing all the γ_i, we have by Lemma A.11 that there is a tame F-torus in $\mathbf{G}'$ containing all the γ_i. Thus, $\underline{\gamma}$ is a good sequence in G'. Put $\mathbf{H} = C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma})$ and $\mathbf{H}' = C_{\mathbf{G}'}^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma})$. By Lemma 6.5, $\mathbf{H}' = \mathbf{H} \cap \mathbf{G}'$. In particular, $\mathbf{H}'$ is an F^{tr}-Levi F-subgroup of $\mathbf{H}$; say L/F is a tame finite extension such that $\mathbf{H}'$ is an L-Levi F-subgroup of $\mathbf{H}$. Since $\underline{\gamma}$ is a normal r-approximation to γ in G, we have that $\gamma_{\ge r} \in H_r \subseteq \mathbf{H}(L)_r$; so, by Lemmata 3.8 and 3.9, we have that $\gamma_{\ge r} \in H' \cap \mathbf{H}(L)_r = H' \cap \mathbf{H}'(L)_r = H'_r$. Thus, $\underline{\gamma}$ is a normal r-approximation to γ in G'. Now another application of Lemmata 3.8 and 3.9, together with Lemma 4.10, gives the desired equality of subsets of $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}', F)$.

Thus, it remains only to show that $\gamma_{<r} \in G'$. Remember that we have assumed that $r \le 0+$, γ is semisimple, *or* $\gamma_{<r} \in G'$. Thus, it suffices to show that either of the first two conditions implies the third.

If γ is semisimple, then, by Corollary 6.14, we have $Z_G^{(r)}(\gamma) \subseteq Z(C_G(\gamma)^\circ) \subseteq G'$. By Remark 6.10(1), $\gamma_{<r} \in Z_G^{(r)}(\gamma)$.

If $r = 0+$, then, by Remark 6.9, $(\gamma_0, \gamma_{>0})$ is a topological F-Jordan decomposition of γ in G, modulo $Z(\mathbf{G})$. Denote by $\overline{\gamma}$ and $\overline{\gamma}_0$ the images of γ and γ_0 in $\widetilde{G}$. By Lemma 2.25 of [43], $\overline{\gamma}_0 \in Z(C_{\widetilde{G}}(\overline{\gamma}))$. Since $\gamma \in C_G^{(r)}(\gamma) = C_G(\gamma_0)^\circ$, we have that $\gamma_0 \in C_G(\gamma)^\circ$, so actually $\overline{\gamma}_0 \in Z(C_{\widetilde{G}}(\overline{\gamma})^\circ)$. Finally, by Proposition 9.6 of [7], we have that $C_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma)^\circ$ surjects onto $C_{\widetilde{\mathbf{G}}}(\overline{\gamma})^\circ$, hence that $Z(C_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma)^\circ)$ surjects onto $Z(C_{\widetilde{\mathbf{G}}}(\overline{\gamma})^\circ)$. Indeed, it is easy to see that $Z(C_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma)^\circ)$ is the full preimage in $\mathbf{G}$ of $Z(C_{\widetilde{\mathbf{G}}}(\overline{\gamma})^\circ)$. Thus, $\gamma_{<r} = \gamma_0 \in Z(C_G(\gamma)^\circ) \subseteq G'$. □

The next two results concern the extent to which a normal approximation to γ is determined by γ. If one is concerned only with semisimple elements (for example, for computing the values of supercuspidal characters of reductive p-adic groups, as in [5]), the argument below can be replaced with a root-value calculation in the spirit of Lemma 6.13 and Corollary 6.14. We prove the results for general elements γ since the argument is not much longer.

Lemma 8.3. *If $\underline{\gamma} = (\gamma_i)_{0 \le i < r}$ is a normal r-approximation to γ and $\gamma_0 = 1$, then $\gamma_i = 1$ for all $0 \le i < \mathrm{d}(\gamma)$.*

Proof. Suppose that $j < \mathrm{d}(\gamma)$, and that $\gamma_i = 1$ for $0 \le i < j$. Then, by Definition 6.8, there is $x \in \mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(j+)}(\gamma), F)$ such that $\gamma \in \gamma_j G_{x,j+} \cap C_G^{(j+)}(\underline{\gamma}) = \gamma_j C_G^{(j+)}(\underline{\gamma})_{x,j+}$. By Lemma 3.10, $\mathrm{d}(\gamma_j) > j$. Since $\gamma_j \in \mathcal{G}_j^G \cup \{1\}$, this means that $\gamma_j = 1$. That is, $\gamma_i = 1$ for all $0 \le i < \mathrm{d}(\gamma)$. □

Proposition 8.4. *If $\underline{\gamma} = (\gamma_i)_{0 \le i < r}$ and $\underline{\gamma}' = (\gamma'_i)_{0 \le i < r}$ are normal r-approximations to γ, then, for all $0 \le i \le r$,*

(Cent$_i$) $$C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(i)}(\underline{\gamma}) = C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(i)}(\underline{\gamma}');$$

and, for all $0 \le i < r$,

(Cong$_i$) $$\gamma'_i \equiv \gamma_i \bmod \bigl(Z_G^{(i)}(\underline{\gamma}) \cap C_G^{(i)}(\underline{\gamma})_i\bigr)\bigl(Z_G^{(i+)}(\underline{\gamma}) \cap C_G^{(i+)}(\underline{\gamma})_{i+}\bigr).$$

Further,

(**Cong**$'_j$) $$\gamma'_j \equiv \gamma_j \bmod \bigl(Z_G^{(j+)}(\underline{\gamma}) \cap C_G^{(j+)}(\underline{\gamma})_{j+}\bigr)$$

whenever $j < r$ *is such that* $\gamma_i = \gamma'_i$ *for* $0 \le i < j$.

Note that, for any index i, (**Cong**$'_i$) implies (**Cong**$_i$).

Proof. Note that (**Cent**$_0$) is true. For $0 \le i \le j < r$, we have that

$$Z_G^{(i)}(\underline{\gamma}) \subseteq Z_G^{(j)}(\underline{\gamma}) \subseteq C_G^{(j)}(\underline{\gamma}) \subseteq C_G^{(i)}(\underline{\gamma}).$$

Suppose that $j \in \mathbb{R}_{\ge 0}$ is such that $j < r$, (**Cent**$_i$) holds for all $0 \le i \le j$, and (**Cong**$_i$) holds for all $0 \le i < j$. In particular, there are elements $z_i \in Z_G^{(i+)}(\underline{\gamma}) \subseteq Z_G^{(j)}(\underline{\gamma})$ such that $\gamma'_i = z_i\gamma_i$ for $0 \le i < j$. If $\gamma_i = \gamma'_i$ for $0 \le i < j$, then $z_i = 1$ for $0 \le i < j$. Put

$$\gamma_{\ge j} = \Bigl(\prod_{0 \le i < j} \gamma_i\Bigr)^{-1}\gamma, \quad \gamma_{>j} = \gamma_j^{-1}\gamma_{\ge j},$$
$$\gamma'_{\ge j} = \Bigl(\prod_{0 \le i < j} \gamma'_i\Bigr)^{-1}\gamma, \quad \gamma'_{>j} = \gamma_j'^{-1}\gamma'_{\ge j}.$$

Then $\gamma_{\ge j} = z\gamma'_{\ge j}$, where $z = \prod_{0 \le i < j} z_i \in Z_G^{(j)}(\underline{\gamma})$. If $\gamma_i = \gamma'_i$ for $0 \le i < j$, then $z = 1$.

Since $C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(j+)}(\underline{\gamma}) = C^{(j+)}_{C^{(j)}_{\mathbf{G}}(\underline{\gamma})}(\underline{\gamma})$, and similarly for $\underline{\gamma}'$, we may, and hence do, replace $\mathbf{G}$ by $C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(j)}(\underline{\gamma}) = C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(j)}(\underline{\gamma}')$.

Since a normal r-approximation to γ is *a fortiori* a normal $(j+)$-approximation to it, there are $x \in \mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(j+)}(\underline{\gamma}), F)$ and $x' \in \mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(j+)}(\underline{\gamma}'), F)$ such that $\mathrm{d}_x(\gamma_{>j}) > j$ and $\mathrm{d}_{x'}(\gamma'_{>j}) > j$. Then

$$\gamma_{\ge j} \in \Upsilon \cap z\Upsilon',$$

where

$$\Upsilon := \gamma_j C_G^{(j+)}(\underline{\gamma})_{x,j+} \quad \text{and} \quad \Upsilon' := \gamma'_j C_G^{(j+)}(\underline{\gamma}')_{x',j+}\,.$$

Since

$$\Upsilon \subseteq G_{x,j} \quad \text{and} \quad \Upsilon' \subseteq G_{x',j}\,,$$

Lemma 3.13 gives

$$(*) \qquad z \in G_{x',j}\,.$$

Thus $\gamma_j C_G^{(j+)}(\underline{\gamma})_{j+} \cap G_{x',j} \ne \emptyset$. By Lemma 7.6, $x' \in \mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(j+)}(\underline{\gamma}), F)$.

Since Υ and Υ' are open, there is a semisimple element δ of $\Upsilon \cap z\Upsilon'$. Since $\gamma_j^{-1}\delta \in \gamma_j^{-1}\Upsilon \subseteq C_G^{(j+)}(\underline{\gamma})_{j+}$, we have that γ_j is a normal $(j+)$-approximation to δ. Thus, by Corollary 6.14, $C_G(\delta)^\circ \subseteq C_G^{(j+)}(\underline{\gamma})$. In particular, $\gamma'_j \in C_G(\delta)^\circ$ belongs to $C_G^{(j+)}(\underline{\gamma})$. Since $x' \in \mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(j+)}(\underline{\gamma}), F)$ and

$\gamma_j'^{-1}z^{-1}\delta \in G_{x',j+}$, we have that $\gamma_j'^{-1}z^{-1}\delta \in C_G^{(j+)}(\underline{\gamma})_{x',j+}$. On the other hand, $z^{-1}\delta \in z^{-1}\Upsilon = z^{-1}\gamma_j C_G^{(j+)}(\underline{\gamma})_{x,j+}$, which (by Remark 6.10(1)) is contained in $Z_G^{(j+)}(\underline{\gamma})C_G^{(j+)}(\underline{\gamma})_{x,j+}$. That is,

$$\gamma_j' C_G^{(j+)}(\underline{\gamma})_{x',j+} \cap Z_G^{(j+)}(\underline{\gamma})C_G^{(j+)}(\underline{\gamma})_{x,j+} \neq \emptyset.$$

By Lemma 3.15, $\gamma_j' \in Z_G^{(j+)}(\underline{\gamma})C_G^{(j+)}(\underline{\gamma})_{j+}$.

Put $\mathbf{H} = C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(j+)}(\underline{\gamma})$, and let $\mathbf{T}'$ be a maximal torus in $\mathbf{H}$ containing γ_j'. Denote by E/F the splitting field of $\mathbf{T}'$. By Lemma 3.9, $\gamma_j' \in Z(\mathbf{H})(E)\mathbf{H}(E)_{j+}$. By Lemma 3.8, $\mathbf{T}'(E) \cap Z(\mathbf{H})(E)\mathbf{H}(E)_{j+} = Z(\mathbf{H})(E)\mathbf{T}'(E)_{j+}$. Thus the root values of γ_j' for $\mathbf{H}$ all lie in $E_{j+}^\times$. (The term "root value" is defined in Definition A.4.) Since $\gamma_j' \in \mathcal{G}_j^H \cup \{1\}$, the set of root values of γ_j' for $\mathbf{H}$ is therefore $\{1\}$; i.e., $\gamma_j' \in Z(H)$. Thus $\mathbf{H} \subseteq C_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma_j')$. Since $\mathbf{H}$ is connected, in fact $\mathbf{H} \subseteq C_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma_j')^\circ = C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(j+)}(\underline{\gamma}')$. The same argument (with the roles of $\underline{\gamma}$ and $\underline{\gamma}'$ reversed) gives the reverse containment; so $C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(j+)}(\underline{\gamma}) = \mathbf{H} = C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(j+)}(\underline{\gamma}')$. This is (**Cent**$_{j+}$).

Now recall that $\Upsilon = \gamma_j C_G^{(j+)}(\underline{\gamma})_{x,j+} = \gamma_j H_{x,j+}$ and, similarly, $\Upsilon' = \gamma_j' H_{x',j+}$, so

$$\gamma_j H_{x,j+} \cap z\gamma_j' H_{x',j+} = \Upsilon \cap z\Upsilon' \neq \emptyset;$$

and γ_j, γ_j', and (by $(*)$) z belong to $Z(H) \cap H_j$. By Lemma 3.12, $Z(H) \cap H_j = Z(H) \cap H_{x',j}$. Therefore, the coset $\gamma_j^{-1}z\gamma_j' H_{x',j+}$ is in $H_{x',j:j+}$ and intersects $H_{x,j+}$. By Lemma 3.10, $\gamma_j^{-1}z\gamma_j' \in H_{j+}$; in fact, $\gamma_j^{-1}z\gamma_j' \in Z(H) \cap H_{j+}$. If $\gamma_i = \gamma_i'$ for $0 \leq i < j$, then $z = 1$, so we have (**Cong**$'_j$). In general, $z \in Z_G^{(j)}(\underline{\gamma})$ and (by $(*)$) $z \in C_G^{(j)}(\underline{\gamma})_j$; so we have (**Cong**$_j$). □

9. NORMAL APPROXIMATIONS AND CONJUGATION

We preserve the notation γ and r of the previous section, so $\gamma \in G$ and $r \in \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{\geq 0}$.

We begin with a result which will play a technical role in [5].

Lemma 9.1. *Suppose that* $i_0, j_0, t_0 \in \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{\geq 0}$ *satisfy* $i_0 + j_0 = t_0$. *Suppose further that*

- γ *has a normal* i_0*-approximation* $\underline{\gamma}$*,*
- $x \in \mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(i_0)}(\underline{\gamma}), F)$*, and*
- $\gamma_{\geq i_0} \in G_{x,i_0}$ *(or* $\operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x})$*, if* $i_0 = 0$*).*

If $k \in G_{x,j_0+}$ *and* $[\gamma, k] \in G_{x,t_0}$*, then* $[\gamma, k] \in (C_G^{(i_0)}(\gamma), G)_{x,(t_0+,t_0)}$.

Proof. We have that $[\gamma, k] = [\gamma_{<i_0}, k] \cdot {}^{\gamma_{<i_0}}[\gamma_{\geq i_0}, k]$. Note that $[\gamma_{\geq i_0}, k] \in G_{x,t_0+}$. By Remark 6.10(2), $\gamma_{<i_0} \in \operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x})$; in particular, $\gamma_{<i_0}$ normalizes

G_{x,t_0+}. Therefore, $[\gamma_{<i_0}, k] \in G_{x,t_0}$. By Lemma 5.30, in fact $[\gamma_{<i_0}, k] \in (C_G^{(i_0)}(\gamma), G)_{x,(t_0+,t_0)}$. The result follows. □

The next result shows that every r-approximation to γ is conjugate to a normal one. After this result, we will assume that γ has a normal r-approximation.

Lemma 9.2. *If $(\underline{\gamma}, x)$ is an r-approximation to γ, then there is some $k \in [\underline{\gamma}; x, r]$ such that ${}^k\underline{\gamma}$ is a normal r-approximation to γ.*

Proof. Trivially, every 0-approximation to γ is normal. If γ has an ∞-approximation, then γ is semisimple. Then, by Lemma 6.11 and Corollary 6.14, such an approximation to γ is normal. Thus, we may, and hence do, assume that $0 < r < \infty$. Write $\underline{\gamma} = (\gamma_i)_{0 \le i < r'}$.

Since all but finitely many γ_i are equal to 1, by Lemma 3.2, there is a complete subfield F' of F such that F/F' is separable, and γ and each γ_i are defined over F'. Since $[\underline{\gamma}; x, r]_{\mathbf{G}(F')} \subseteq [\underline{\gamma}; x, r]$ by Remark 6.7(2), it suffices to assume that F is complete.

In this setting, we need only show that, if $d \in \mathbb{R}_{\ge 0}$ is such that $d < r$ and $(\underline{\gamma}, x)$ is a normal d-approximation (as well as an r-approximation), then there is some $k \in [\underline{\gamma}; x, r]$ such that ${}^k\underline{\gamma}$ is a normal $(d+)$-approximation. Let $\mathbf{H} = C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(d)}(\underline{\gamma})$. By Definition 6.8, $x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{H}, F)$ and

$$\gamma \in \Bigl(\prod_{0 \le i < r} \gamma_i\Bigr) G_{x,r} \cap H = \Bigl(\prod_{0 \le i < r} \gamma_i\Bigr) H_{x,r}\,.$$

By Corollary 7.5, there is some $k \in H_{x,r-d} \subseteq [\underline{\gamma}; x, r]$ such that

$$\Bigl(\prod_{0 \le i < d} \gamma_i\Bigr)^{-1}({}^{k^{-1}}\gamma) = {}^{k^{-1}}\Bigl[\Bigl(\prod_{0 \le i < d} \gamma_i\Bigr)^{-1}\gamma\Bigr] \in \Bigl(\prod_{d \le i < r} \gamma_i\Bigr) C_H(\gamma_d)_{x,r}\,.$$

That is, ${}^{k^{-1}}\gamma$ commutes with γ_i for $0 \le i \le d$. By Lemma 6.11, ${}^k\underline{\gamma} = ({}^k\gamma_i)_{0 \le i < r'}$ is a normal $(d+)$-approximation to γ. □

From now on, assume that γ has a normal r-approximation $\underline{\gamma} = (\gamma_i)_{0 \le i < r}$. By Proposition 8.4, the choice of this approximation will not affect any of the results or definitions that follow.

Definition 9.3. Put $C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\gamma) = C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma})$, $C_G^{(r)}(\gamma) = C_G^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma})$, $Z_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\gamma) = Z_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma})$, $Z_G^{(r)}(\gamma) = Z_G^{(r)}(\underline{\gamma})$, $[\gamma; x, r]^{(j)} = [\underline{\gamma}; x, r]^{(j)}$, $[\gamma; x, r] = [\gamma; x, r]^{(\infty)}$, $[\![\gamma; x, r]\!]^{(j)} = [\![\underline{\gamma}; x, r]\!]^{(j)}$, and $[\![\gamma; x, r]\!] = [\![\gamma; x, r]\!]^{(\infty)}$ for $(j, x) \in \widetilde{\mathbb{R}} \times \mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\gamma), F)$.

Remark 9.4. If $(\underline{\gamma}', x)$ is a (not necessarily normal) r-approximation to γ, then, by Lemma 9.2, there is $k \in [\underline{\gamma}'; x, r]$ such that ${}^k\underline{\gamma}'$ is a normal r-approximation to γ. Then

$$[\gamma; x, r] = [{}^k\underline{\gamma}'; x, r] = {}^k[\underline{\gamma}'; x, r] = [\underline{\gamma}'; x, r].$$

Definition 9.5. Put

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_r(\gamma) &= \bigl\{x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F) \bigm| \gamma\overline{x} = \overline{x}\bigr\} && \text{if } r = 0, \\ \mathcal{B}_r(\gamma) &= \Bigl\{x \in \mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\gamma), F) \Bigm| Z_G^{(r)}(\gamma)\gamma \cap G_{x,r} \neq \emptyset\Bigr\} && \text{if } r \in \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{>0}. \end{aligned}$$

The next result shows that, for $r > 0$, $\mathcal{B}_r(\gamma)$ is precisely the set of points x such that $(\underline{\gamma}, x)$ is a normal r-approximation. (In fact, that is also true for $r = 0$.)

Lemma 9.6. *If $r > 0$, then*

$$\mathcal{B}_r(\gamma) = \Bigl\{x \in \mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\gamma), F) \Bigm| \mathrm{d}_x(\gamma_{\ge r}) \ge r\Bigr\}.$$

Proof. By Remark 6.10(1), $\gamma_{\ge r} = \gamma_{<r}^{-1}\gamma \in Z_G^{(r)}(\gamma)\gamma$. By Definition 6.8, $\gamma_{\ge r} \in G_{y,r} \cap C_G^{(r)}(\gamma) = C_G^{(r)}(\gamma)_{y,r} \subseteq C_G^{(r)}(\gamma)_r$ (for some $y \in \mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\gamma), F)$).

Suppose that $x \in \mathcal{B}_r(\gamma)$. Then $Z_G^{(r)}(\gamma)\gamma \subseteq Z_G^{(r)}(\gamma)G_{x,r}$, so $\gamma_{\ge r} \in Z_G^{(r)}(\gamma)G_{x,r} \cap C_G^{(r)}(\gamma) = Z_G^{(r)}(\gamma)C_G^{(r)}(\gamma)_{x,r}$. By Corollary 3.14, $\gamma_{\ge r} \in G_{x,r}$.

On the other hand, suppose that $\mathrm{d}_x(\gamma_{\ge r}) \ge r$. Then $\gamma_{\ge r} \in Z_G^{(r)}(\gamma)\gamma \cap G_{x,r}$, so the intersection is non-empty. ☐

Corollary 9.7. *If γ has a normal $(r+)$-approximation, then $\mathcal{B}_r(\gamma) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r+)}(\gamma), F)$.*

Proof. This follows immediately from Lemmata 7.6 and 9.6. ☐

The next result is an analogue of Lemma 3.6 of [31].

Lemma 9.8. *Fix $d \in \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{\ge 0}$. Suppose that*

- $x \in \mathcal{B}_r(\gamma)$,
- $g \in G_{x,\max\{d,0+\}}$, *and*
- $[\gamma, g] \in G_{x,d+r}$.

Then $g \in [\gamma; x, d + r]$.

Proof. Since $[\gamma; x, 0] = G_{x,0+}$, the result is trivial if $d + r = 0$; so we assume that $d + r > 0$.

Let $\mathbf{T}$ be a maximal F-torus in $C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\gamma)$, and E/F the splitting field of $\mathbf{T}$. By Lemma 3.7,

$$g \in \mathbf{G}(E)_{x,d} \quad \text{and} \quad [\gamma, g] \in \mathbf{G}(E)_{x,d+r}.$$

If $r = 0$, then, since $\gamma = \gamma_{\ge r}$ stabilizes $\overline{x}$, hence $\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,d}$, we have $[\gamma_{\ge r}, g] \in \mathbf{G}(E)_{x,d} = \mathbf{G}(E)_{x,d+r}$. If $r > 0$, then $\gamma_{\ge r} \in G_{x,r} \subseteq \mathbf{G}(E)_{x,r}$, so again $[\gamma_{\ge r}, g] \in G_{x,d+r} \subseteq \mathbf{G}(E)_{x,d+r}$. By Remark 6.10(2), $\gamma_{<r} \in \operatorname{stab}_{\mathbf{G}(E)}(\overline{x})$, so ${}^{\gamma_{<r}}[\gamma_{\ge r}, g] \in \mathbf{G}(E)_{x,d+r}$. Since $[\gamma, g] = {}^{\gamma_{<r}}[\gamma_{\ge r}, g] \cdot [\gamma_{<r}, g]$, also $[\gamma_{<r}, g] \in \mathbf{G}(E)_{x,d+r}$; i.e., $\operatorname{Int}(\gamma_{<r})g \equiv g \pmod{\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,d+r}}$. By Remark 3.4, the multiplication map

$$(*) \qquad \prod_{\alpha \in \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{T})} (\mathbf{U}_\alpha(E) \cap \mathbf{G}(E)_{x,\max\{d,0+\}}) \longrightarrow \mathbf{G}(E)_{x,\max\{d,0+\}}$$

is a bijection. Denote by $(g_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{T})}$ the preimage of g under $(*)$. Let $(\mathsf{e}_\alpha : E \longrightarrow \mathbf{U}_\alpha(E))_{\alpha \in \Phi(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{T})}$ be the isomorphisms of §3.3, and, for $\alpha \in \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$ and $t \in E$, let $\mathsf{m}_{\alpha,t}$ be the endomorphism of $\mathbf{U}_\alpha(E)$ given by

$$u \mapsto \begin{cases} \mathsf{e}_\alpha(t \cdot \mathsf{e}_\alpha^{-1}(u)), & \alpha \in \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T}) \\ u, & \alpha = 0. \end{cases}$$

Then the preimage of $\operatorname{Int}(\gamma_{<r})g$ under $(*)$ is $(\mathsf{m}_{\alpha,\alpha(\gamma_{<r})}(g_\alpha))_{\alpha \in \widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{T})}$. Recall that $\operatorname{Int}(\gamma_{<r})g \equiv g \pmod{\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,d+r}}$. By Corollary 5.25 (applied to the constant functions f_1 and f_2 with values $\max\{d, 0+\}$ and $d+r$, respectively) gives that $\mathsf{m}_{\alpha,\alpha(\gamma_{<r})}(g_\alpha) \equiv g_\alpha \pmod{\mathbf{G}(E)_{x,d+r}}$, i.e.,

$$\mathsf{m}_{\alpha,\alpha(\gamma_{<r})-1}(g_\alpha) = \mathsf{m}_{\alpha,\alpha(\gamma_{<r})}(g_\alpha) \cdot g_\alpha^{-1} \in \mathbf{U}_\alpha(E) \cap \mathbf{G}(E)_{x,d+r},$$

for $\alpha \in \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$.

Fix $\alpha \in \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$. If $\alpha(\gamma_i) = 1$ for $0 \le i < r$, then $\mathbf{U}_\alpha \subseteq C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\gamma)$, so $g_\alpha \in C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\gamma)(E) \cap \mathbf{G}(E)_{x,d} \subseteq [\gamma; x, d+r]$. If $\alpha(\gamma_i) \ne 1$ for some $0 \le i < r$, then, by Lemma 6.13, $i_\alpha := \operatorname{ord}(\alpha(\gamma_{<r}) - 1) = \min\{i \mid \alpha(\gamma_i) \ne 1\}$. By Remark 3.4, $\mathbf{U}_\alpha(E) \cap \mathbf{G}(E)_{x,d+r} = U_\psi$, where ψ is the affine function on $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{T})$ with gradient α satisfying $\psi(x) = d + r$. Then $\mathbf{U}_\alpha \subseteq C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(i_\alpha)}(\gamma)$, so

$$U_{\psi - i_\alpha} \subseteq C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(i_\alpha)}(\gamma)(E)_{x,(d+r)-i_\alpha} \subseteq [\gamma; x, d + r]_{\mathbf{G}(E)}.$$

In particular,

$$g_\alpha \in \mathsf{m}_{\alpha,\alpha(\gamma_{<r})-1}^{-1}(U_\psi) = U_{\psi - i_\alpha} \subseteq [\gamma; x, d + r]_{\mathbf{G}(E)}.$$

By Remark 6.7(2), $[\gamma; x, d+r]_{\mathbf{G}(E)} \cap G_{x,0+} = [\gamma; x, d+r]_G$, so $g = \prod g_\alpha \in [\gamma; x, d + r]_G$. □

Remark 9.9. We will often apply the above lemma with $d = 0$ and $r = \mathrm{d}_x([\gamma, g])$.

The following "rigidity" result will help us in [5] to apply Harish-Chandra's character formula.

Lemma 9.10. *Suppose that*

- $(\mathbf{G}', \mathbf{G})$ *is a tame reductive* F*-sequence;*
- $x \in \mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\gamma), F) \cap \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}', F)$*;*

- $k \in G_{x,0+}$ *; and*
- $Z_G^{(r)}(\gamma)$ *and* ${}^k Z_G^{(r)}(\gamma)$ *are contained in* G'.

Then $k \in G'_{x,0+} C_G^{(r)}(\gamma)_{x,0+}$.

Note that the statement can also be rewritten as ${}^{G_{x,0+}}\gamma \cap G' = {}^{G'_{x,0+}}\gamma$ (under the stated conditions on γ and x).

Proof. Since the result does not change if we replace γ by $\gamma_{<r}$, we do so. Then $\gamma_{\geq r} = 1$, so, by Lemma 9.6, $\mathcal{B}_r(\gamma) = \mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\gamma), F)$. In particular, $x \in \mathcal{B}_r(\gamma)$.

Let i_0 be the greatest index i such that $k \in G'_{x,0+} C_G^{(i)}(\gamma)_{x,0+}$. If $i_0 \geq r$, then we are done, so we may, and hence do, assume that $i_0 < r$. Since the hypotheses and conclusion do not change if we replace k by a left $G'_{x,0+}$-translate, we may, and hence do, assume further that $k \in C_G^{(i_0)}(\gamma)_{x,0+}$.

By Remark 6.10(1), $\gamma_i \in Z_G^{(r)}(\gamma) \subseteq G'$, and similarly ${}^k\gamma_i \in G'$, for $0 \leq i < r$. By applying Lemma 7.6 repeatedly, one sees that x belongs to $\mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}'}^{(i_0)}(\gamma), F)$ (in fact, to $\mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}'}^{(r)}(\gamma), F)$). Thus we may, and hence do, replace $\mathbf{G}$ and $\mathbf{G}'$ by $C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(i_0)}(\gamma)$ and $C_{\mathbf{G}'}^{(i_0)}(\gamma)$, respectively. Now $\gamma_{<i_0}$ and $\gamma_{\leq i_0}$, as well as their k-conjugates, belong to G'; so $\gamma_{\geq i_0}$ and $\gamma_{>i_0}$, as well as their k-conjugates, belong to G'.

Since $x \in \mathcal{B}_r(\gamma)$, *a fortiori* $x \in \mathcal{B}_{i_0}(\gamma)$ and $x \in \mathcal{B}_{i_0+}(\gamma)$; so $\gamma_{\geq i_0} \in G_{x,i_0}$ (or $\operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x})$, if $i_0 = 0$) and $\gamma_{>i_0} \in G_{x,i_0+}$. Thus

$$ {}^k\gamma_{\geq i_0} \in \gamma_{\geq i_0} G_{x,i_0+} \cap G' = \gamma_{i_0} G_{x,i_0+} \cap G' = \gamma_{i_0} G'_{x,i_0+}, $$

so $((\gamma_{i_0}), x)$ is an (i_0+)-approximation (in G') to ${}^k\gamma_{\geq i_0} \in G'$. By Lemma 9.2, there exists $h \in G'_{x,0+}$ such that $(({}^h\gamma_{i_0}), x)$ is a normal (i_0+)-approximation to ${}^k\gamma_{\geq i_0}$; that is,

$$ {}^k\gamma_{\geq i_0} \in ({}^h\gamma_{i_0}) \cdot C_G({}^h\gamma_{i_0})_{x,i_0+} = {}^h(\gamma_{i_0} C_G(\gamma_{i_0})_{x,i_0+}). $$

By Lemma 7.1, $h^{-1}k \in C_G(\gamma_{i_0})$. In fact, since $h, k \in G_{x,0+}$ and $x \in \mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma_{i_0}), F)$, we have by Corollary 4.8 that $h^{-1}k \in C_G(\gamma_{i_0})_{x,0+}$. Note that, since $\mathbf{G} = C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(i_0)}(\gamma)$, we have $C_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma_{i_0})^\circ = C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(i_0+)}(\gamma)$, so that $h^{-1}k \in C_G^{(i_0+)}(\gamma)_{x,0+}$. Since $h \in G'_{x,0+}$, we have $k \in G'_{x,0+} C_G^{(i_0+)}(\gamma)_{x,0+}$, which is a contradiction of the definition of i_0. $\square$

Now we prove a few technical lemmata which will come in handy in the proof of Proposition 9.14.

Lemma 9.11. *Suppose that*

- $t \in \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{\geq 0}$,
- $(\mathbf{G}', \mathbf{G})$ *is a tame Levi* F*-sequence,*
- $\mathbf{G}'/Z(\mathbf{G}')$ *is* F*-anisotropic, and*

- $x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}', F)$.

Then $(G' \cap \operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x}))G_{x,t} \cap G_0 \subseteq G_{x,0}$, *and* $\mathrm{d}_x(g) \geq \min\{t, \mathrm{d}(g)\}$ *for* $g \in (G' \cap \operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x}))G_{x,t} \cap G_0$.

Proof. The containment follows from Lemma 3.11.

Suppose that $g \in (G' \cap \operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x}))G_{x,t} \cap G_0$ and $j := \mathrm{d}_x(g) < \mathrm{d}(g)$. If $j < t$, then, by Lemma 3.10, $gG_{x,j+} \subseteq G_{j+}$. By Lemmata 3.9, 3.8, and 3.7, we have $G' \cap G_{j+} = G'_{j+} = G'_{x,j+}$. Thus, since $gG_{x,j+} \cap G' \neq \emptyset$, in fact $gG_{x,j+} \cap G'_{x,j+} \neq \emptyset$; so $g \in G_{x,j+}$, which is a contradiction. □

Lemma 9.12. *Suppose that*

- $t \in \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{\geq 0}$,
- $(\mathbf{G}', \mathbf{G})$ *is a tame Levi* F*-sequence,*
- $Z_G^{(t)}(\gamma) \subseteq {}^{[\gamma;x,t]}G'$,
- $x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}', F) \cap \mathcal{B}_t(\gamma)$, *and*
- $\gamma \in {}^{[\gamma;x,t]}(G'G_{x,t+})$.

Then $\gamma \in (G' \cap \operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x}))G_{x,t+}$.

Proof. Note that $\gamma_{<t} \in \operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x})$ by Remark 6.10(2), and $\gamma_{\geq t} \in \operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x})$ by Lemma 9.6 (if $t > 0$) or by Definition 9.5 (if $t = 0$). Thus also $\gamma \in \operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x})$.

In particular, if $t = 0$, then, since $[\gamma; x, 0] \subseteq G_{x,0+}$ (in fact, we have equality), any $[\gamma; x, t]$-conjugate of γ lies in $\gamma G_{x,0+}$; so the result is easy. Thus we may, and hence do, assume that $t > 0$.

By hypothesis, there is $k \in [\gamma; x, t]$ such that ${}^k\gamma_{<t} \in G'$. By Corollary 6.14, $C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(t)}({}^k\gamma) = C_{\mathbf{G}}({}^k\gamma_{<t})^\circ$, so $Z_{\mathbf{G}}^{(t)}(\gamma) = Z(C_{\mathbf{G}}({}^k\gamma_{<t})^\circ) \subseteq \mathbf{G}'$. Upon replacing γ by ${}^k\gamma$, we may, and hence do, assume that $Z_G^{(t)}(\gamma) \subseteq G'$. In particular, by Remark 6.10(1), $\gamma_{<t} \in G'$; so, by hypothesis, $\gamma \in G'G_{x,t}$. Since $\mathbf{G}'$ is an F^{tr}-Levi F-subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$, there is a tame F-torus $\mathbf{S}' \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ such that $\mathbf{G}' = C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S}')$. Since $\gamma_{<t} \in G'$, we have $\mathbf{S}' \subseteq C_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma_{<t})^\circ$; so, by Corollary 6.14, $\mathbf{S}' \subseteq C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(t)}(\gamma)$.

Let $\mathbf{S}$ be a maximal tame-modulo-center F-torus containing $\mathbf{S}'$, hence contained in $\mathbf{G}'$. By Definitions 6.1 and 6.8, the terms γ_i for $0 \leq i < t$ belong to a tame-modulo-center F-torus in $C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(t)}(\gamma)$. Therefore, by Lemma A.3, the terms γ_i for $0 \leq i < t$ in fact belong to S. Thus $(\gamma_i)_{0 \leq i < t}$ is a good sequence in G'. By abuse of language, we will write (for example) $C_{\mathbf{G}'}^{(t)}(\gamma)$ in place of $C_{\mathbf{G}'}^{(t)}((\gamma_i)_{0 \leq i < t})$, even though possibly $\gamma \notin G'$. Let $\mathbf{T}$ be a maximal F-torus in $\mathbf{G}'$ containing $\mathbf{S}$. Now recall that $[\gamma; x, t]_G = \vec{G}_{x,\vec{t}}$, where $\vec{G} := (C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(i)}(\gamma))_{0 \leq i < t}$ and $\vec{t} := (t - i)_{0 \leq i < t}$; and, similarly, $[\gamma; x, t]_{G'} = \vec{G}'_{x,\vec{t}}$, where $\vec{G}' := (C_{\mathbf{G}'}^{(i)}(\gamma))_{0 \leq i < t}$. Let $f^\perp$ be the function on $\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$ such that

$$f^{\perp}(\alpha) = \min\Bigl\{ (t-i)+ \Bigm| \alpha \in \Phi(C^{(i)}_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma), \mathbf{T}) \Bigr\}$$

for $\alpha \in \Phi(\mathbf{G}', \mathbf{T}) \smallsetminus \Phi(C^{(t)}_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma), \mathbf{T})$;

$$f^{\perp}(\alpha) = 0+$$

for $\alpha \in \widetilde{\Phi}(C^{(t)}_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma), \mathbf{T})$; and

$$f^{\perp}(\alpha) = \min\Bigl\{ t-i \Bigm| \alpha \in \Phi(C^{(i)}_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma), \mathbf{T}) \Bigr\}$$

otherwise. Note that this function is concave. By hypothesis, we may, and hence do, choose $k \in [\gamma; x, t]_G$ such that ${}^k\gamma \in G'G_{x,t+}$. Then, by Proposition 5.40, there exist $k' \in [\gamma; x, t]_{G'}$ and $k^{\perp} \in {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f^{\perp}}$ such that $k = k'k^{\perp}$. Modulo $G_{x,t+}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} {}^{k}\gamma = {}^{k'}(\gamma[\gamma^{-1}, k^{\perp}]) &\equiv {}^{k'}\gamma \cdot [\gamma^{-1}, k^{\perp}] \\ &= [k', \gamma] \cdot \gamma \cdot [\gamma^{-1}, k^{\perp}] \equiv [k', \gamma_{<t}] \cdot \gamma_{<t}\gamma_{\ge t} \cdot [\gamma_{<t}^{-1}, k^{\perp}]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\gamma_{<t} \in G'$, also $[k', \gamma_{<t}] \in G'$. Thus

$$\gamma_{\ge t} \cdot [\gamma_{<t}^{-1}, k^{\perp}] \in G'G_{x,t+}\,.$$

By Remark 6.10(3), $[\gamma_{<t}^{-1}, k^{\perp}] \in G_{x,t}$. Thus in fact

$$\gamma_{\ge t} \cdot [\gamma_{<t}^{-1}, k^{\perp}] \in G'G_{x,t+} \cap G_{x,t} = (G', G)_{x,(t,t+)}.$$

Recall that $\gamma_{\ge t} \in C^{(t)}_{G}(\gamma)_{x,t}$, so

$$[\gamma_{<t}^{-1}, k^{\perp}] \in \gamma_{\ge t}^{-1}(G', G)_{x,(t,t+)} \subseteq {}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f}\,, \tag{$*$}$$

where f is the function on $\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$ which takes the value t on $\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{G}', \mathbf{T}) \cup \widetilde{\Phi}(C^{(t)}_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma), \mathbf{T})$ and the value $t+$ elsewhere. In particular, $[\gamma_{<t}^{-1}, k^{\perp}] \in G_{x,t}$. Then we have

$$[\gamma_{<t}^{-1}, k^{\perp}] \in (C^{(t)}_{G}(\gamma), G)_{x,(t+,t)} \tag{$**$}$$

by Lemma 5.30. Finally, by Proposition 5.40, we may write $k^{\perp} = \prod_{0 \le i < t} k_i^{\perp}$, where $k_i^{\perp} \in (C^{(i)}_{G'}(\gamma), C^{(i)}_{G}(\gamma))_{x,((t-i)+,t-i)}$ for $0 \le i < t$. Put $\gamma' := \gamma_{<t}$. Then, with the obvious notation, we have

$$[\gamma'^{-1}, k^{\perp}] = \prod_{0 \le i < t} {}^{k^{\perp}_{<i}}[\gamma'^{-1}, k_i^{\perp}] = \prod_{0 \le i < t} {}^{k^{\perp}_{<i}}[\gamma'^{-1}_{\ge i}, k_i^{\perp}].$$

By Lemma 5.32, $[\gamma'^{-1}_{\ge i}, k_i^{\perp}] \in (C^{(i)}_{G'}(\gamma), C^{(i)}_{G}(\gamma))_{x,(t+,t)} \subseteq (G', G)_{x,(t+,t)}$. In particular, $[\gamma'^{-1}_{\ge i}, k_i^{\perp}] \in G_{x,t}$. Since $k^{\perp}_{<i} \in G_{x,0+}$, the commutator

of $k^\perp_{<i}$ with $[\gamma'^{-1}_{\geq i}, k^\perp_i]$ lies in $G_{x,t+} \subseteq (G', G)_{x,(t+,t)}$, so ${}^{k^\perp_{<i}}[\gamma'^{-1}_{\geq i}, k^\perp_i] \in (G', G)_{x,(t+,t)}$ also. Thus

$$[\gamma'^{-1}, k^\perp] \in (G', G)_{x,(t+,t)}. \tag{$***$}$$

(It is also possible to show this directly, without appealing to Proposition 5.40, as in Remark 6.10(3); but the argument is more complicated.) By Lemma 5.29 and Remark 5.31, it follows from $(*)$, $(**)$, and $(***)$ that $[\gamma^{-1}_{<t}, k^\perp] \in G_{x,t+}$, hence also $[\gamma^{-1}, k^\perp] \in G_{x,t+}$. Further, ${}^{k^\perp}\gamma = \gamma[\gamma^{-1}, k^\perp] \in \gamma G_{x,t+}$ and ${}^{k^\perp}\gamma = {}^{k'^{-1}k}\gamma \in {}^{k'^{-1}}(G'G_{x,t+}) = G'G_{x,t+}$, so $\gamma \in G'G_{x,t+}$. □

Recall that $r \in \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{\geq 0}$.

Lemma 9.13. *Suppose that*

- $(\mathbf{G}', \mathbf{G})$ *is a tame Levi* F*-sequence,*
- $\mathbf{G}'/Z(\mathbf{G}')$ *is* F*-anisotropic,*
- $x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}', F)$*, and*
- $\gamma \in (G' \cap \operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x}))G_{x,r}$.

Then $x \in \mathcal{B}_r(\gamma)$.

Proof. If $r = 0$, then, since $\mathcal{B}_0(\gamma)$ is the set of points in $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F)$ whose image in $\mathcal{B}^{\text{red}}(\mathbf{G}, F)$ is fixed by γ, in particular $\{\overline{x}\} \times V_F(Z(\mathbf{G})) \subseteq \mathcal{B}_0(\gamma)$; so we are done. If $r = \infty$, then $\mathcal{B}_r(\gamma) = \mathcal{B}(C^{(\infty)}_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma), F) = \mathcal{B}(C^{(r')}_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma), F)$ for $r' \in \mathbb{R}$ sufficiently large. Thus we may, and hence do, assume that $0 < r < \infty$.

Now it suffices to show that, if $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with $t < r$, and $x \in \mathcal{B}_t(\gamma)$, then $x \in \mathcal{B}_{t+}(\gamma)$. Since $\mathcal{B}_t(\gamma) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(C^{(t+)}_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma), F)$ by Corollary 9.7, Lemma 9.6 shows that it suffices to prove $\gamma_{>t} \in G_{x,t+}$. By Lemma 9.11, since $\mathrm{d}(\gamma_{>t}) > t$, it suffices to prove that $\gamma_{>t} \in {}^{\operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x})}\big((G' \cap \operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x}))G_{x,t+}\big)$.

First suppose that $t = 0$. Write $\gamma = \gamma'\gamma^\perp$, with $\gamma' \in \operatorname{stab}_{G'}(\overline{x})$ and $\gamma^\perp \in G_{x,r}$. By Proposition 2.36 of [43], $\overline{\gamma}'$ has a topological Jordan decomposition $\overline{\gamma}' = \overline{\gamma}'_{\text{as}}\overline{\gamma}'_{\text{tu}}$ in $\widetilde{\mathbf{G}}'$ (where $\widetilde{\mathbf{G}}' = \mathbf{G}'/Z(\mathbf{G})^\circ$). Then $((\overline{\gamma}'_{\text{as}}), \overline{x})$ is a normal $(0+)$-approximation to $\overline{\gamma}'$, so $((\overline{\gamma}'_{\text{as}}), \overline{x})$ is a $(0+)$-approximation to $\overline{\gamma}$. By Lemma 9.2, there is $\overline{k} \in \widetilde{G}_{\overline{x},0+}$ such that $({}^{\overline{k}}\overline{\gamma}'_{\text{as}})$ is a normal $(0+)$-approximation to $\overline{\gamma}$; in particular, $\overline{\gamma} = {}^{\overline{k}}\overline{\gamma}'_{\text{as}} \cdot ({}^{\overline{k}}\overline{\gamma}'^{-1}_{\text{as}})\overline{\gamma}$ is a topological Jordan decomposition. On the other hand, $\overline{\gamma} = \overline{\gamma}_0\overline{\gamma}_{>0}$ is also a topological Jordan decomposition, so, by Proposition 2.24, $\overline{\gamma}_0 = {}^{\overline{k}}\overline{\gamma}'_{\text{as}} \in \overline{\gamma}'_{\text{as}}\widetilde{G}_{\overline{x},0+} = \overline{\gamma}\widetilde{G}_{\overline{x},0+}$. Thus $\overline{\gamma}_{>0} = \overline{\gamma}_0^{-1}\overline{\gamma} \in \widetilde{G}_{\overline{x},0+}$, so there is a small neighborhood U of x in $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F)$ so that $\overline{\gamma}_{>0} \in \widetilde{G}_{\overline{x}',0+}$ for $x' \in U$. Thus, by Lemma 3.11, $\gamma_{>0} \in G_{0+} \cap \bigcap_{x' \in U} \operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x}') = G_{0+} \cap \bigcap_{x' \in U} G_{x'}$. By Lemma 3.10, the image of $\gamma_{>0}$ in $(\mathsf{G}^F_x)^\circ(\overline{\mathfrak{f}})$ is unipotent. By Proposition 5.1.32(i) of

[13], for every parabolic subgroup $\mathsf{P} \subseteq \mathsf{G}_x$, there is a facet $J = J_{\mathsf{P}}$ of $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}, F^{\mathrm{un}})$ containing x in its closure such that $\mathsf{P}(\bar{\mathfrak{f}})$ is the image in $\mathsf{G}_x(\bar{\mathfrak{f}})$ of $\mathbf{G}(F^{\mathrm{un}})_y$ for any $y \in J$. Now $\widetilde{G}_{\overline{x},0+} \subseteq \widetilde{\mathbf{G}}(F^{\mathrm{un}})_{\overline{x},0+} \subseteq \widetilde{\mathbf{G}}(F^{\mathrm{un}})_{\overline{y},0+}$, so $\gamma_{>0} \in \operatorname{stab}_{\mathbf{G}(F^{\mathrm{un}})}(\overline{y})$, for $y \in \bigcup_{\mathsf{P}} J_{\mathsf{P}}$. Since $\gamma_{>0} \in G_{0+} \subseteq \mathbf{G}(F^{\mathrm{un}})_{0+}$, Lemma 3.11 gives $\gamma_{>0} \in \mathbf{G}(F^{\mathrm{un}})_y$ for $y \in \bigcup_{\mathsf{P}} J_{\mathsf{P}}$; that is, the image of $\gamma_{>0}$ in $\mathsf{G}_x(\bar{\mathfrak{f}})$ lies in $\bigcap_{\mathsf{P}} \mathsf{P}(\bar{\mathfrak{f}})$. By Theorem 13.16 of [7] and the fact that G_x is reductive, we have that the image of $\gamma_{>0}$ lies in every maximal torus in G_x; in particular, is semisimple. On the other hand, since $\gamma_{>0} \in G_{0+}$, by Lemma 3.10 there is a facet J containing x in its closure such that $\gamma_{>0} \in G_{y,0+}$ for $y \in J$. By another application of Proposition 5.1.32(i) of [13], the image of $\gamma_{>0}$ in $\mathsf{G}_x(\mathfrak{f})$ is unipotent. Thus this image is trivial, so $\gamma_{>0} \in G_{x,0+}$, as desired.

Now suppose that $t > 0$. Since $\gamma_{\geq t} \in G_{x,t}$, we have that $\gamma_{<t} G_{x,t} \cap (G' \cap \operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x})) \neq \emptyset$. Since the intersection is an open subset of G', it contains a semisimple element, say g'. Then $\underline{\gamma}$ is a t-approximation to g', so, by Lemma 9.2, there is an element $k \in [\gamma; x, t]$ such that ${}^k\underline{\gamma}$ is a normal t-approximation to g'. In particular, by Corollary 6.14, $Z_{\mathbf{G}}^{(t)}({}^k\underline{\gamma}) \subseteq Z(C_{\mathbf{G}}(g')^\circ) \subseteq \mathbf{G}'$; so, by Remark 6.10(1), ${}^k\gamma_i \in G'$ for $0 \leq i < t$ (hence also ${}^k\gamma_{<t} \in G'$). Put $\gamma' = {}^k\gamma$, and note that $x \in \mathcal{B}_t(\gamma')$ (hence, by Corollary 9.7, $x \in \mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(t+)}(\gamma'), F)$). Then $[\gamma'; x, t] = {}^k[\gamma; x, t] = [\gamma; x, t]$, so $\gamma' \in {}^{[\gamma';x,t]}\bigl((G' \cap \operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x}))G_{x,t+}\bigr)$. By Lemma 9.12, $\gamma' \in G'G_{x,t+}$. Since $\gamma'_{<t} = {}^k\gamma_{<t} \in G'$, also $\gamma'_{\geq t} \in G'G_{x,t+}$.

As before, there is a semisimple element $g'' \in \gamma'_{\geq t} G_{x,t+} \cap G'$. Since $x \in \mathcal{B}_t(\gamma)$, and $\mathcal{B}_t(\gamma) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(t+)}(\gamma), F)$ by Corollary 9.7, we have by Lemma 9.6 that $\gamma'_{\geq t} \in G_{x,t}$ and by Lemma 3.12 that $\gamma'_t \in G_{x,t}$. Thus $\gamma'_{>t} \in G_{x,t}$. By Corollary 7.5, there is $h \in G_{x,0+}$ such that ${}^h g'' \in \gamma'_{\geq t} C_G(\gamma'_t)_{x,t+}$. By Lemma 3.10, $\gamma'_{\geq t} C_G(\gamma'_t)_{x,t+} \subseteq \gamma'_t C_G(\gamma'_t)_{t+}$. In particular, (γ'_t) is a normal $(t+)$-approximation to ${}^h g''$; so, by Corollary 6.14, $Z(C_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma'_t)^\circ) \subseteq Z(C_{\mathbf{G}}({}^h g'')^\circ) \subseteq {}^h\mathbf{G}'$. Since $\gamma'_t \in Z(C_G(\gamma'_t)^\circ)$, we have $\gamma'_t \in {}^hG'$. Thus $\gamma'_t \in {}^hG' \cap G_{x,t} = {}^hG'_{x,t} \subseteq (G', G)_{x,(t,t+)}$. Since we saw above that $\gamma'_{\geq t} \in G'G_{x,t+} \cap G_{x,t} = (G', G)_{x,(t,t+)}$, we have that $\gamma'_{>t} \in (G', G)_{x,(t,t+)} \subseteq (G' \cap \operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x}))G_{x,t+}$, as desired. ☐

Proposition 9.14. *Suppose that*

- $r \in \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}_{>0}$*;*
- $(\mathbf{G}', \mathbf{G})$ *is a tame reductive* F*-sequence;*
- $x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}', F)$*; and*
- $x \in \mathcal{B}_r(\gamma)$ *or* $\mathbf{G}'/Z(\mathbf{G}')$ *is* F*-anisotropic.*

Then $\gamma \in (G' \cap \operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x}))G_{x,r}$ *if and only if*

(1) $Z_G^{(r)}(\gamma)\gamma \cap G_{x,r} \neq \emptyset$*, and*

(2) ${}^k Z_G^{(r)}(\gamma) \subseteq G'$ *for some* $k \in [\gamma; x, r]$.

Remark 9.15. As in the proof of Lemma 9.12, we could, if desired, replace the condition that ${}^k Z_G^{(r)}(\gamma) \subseteq G'$ for some $k \in [\gamma; x, r]$ by the condition that $Z_G^{(r)}(\gamma) \subseteq {}^{[\gamma;x,r]}G'$; but the stated form is more convenient for our purposes. An appropriate modification of Proposition 9.14 also holds for $r = 0$. We do not state it, since the modified result is vacuous.

Proof. For the 'only if' direction, suppose that $\gamma \in (G' \cap \operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x}))G_{x,r}$. If $\mathbf{G}'/Z(\mathbf{G}')$ is F-anisotropic, then Lemma 9.13 implies that $x \in \mathcal{B}_r(\gamma)$. Therefore, we may assume $x \in \mathcal{B}_r(\gamma)$. By Definition 9.5, (1) holds.

By Lemma 9.6, we have $\gamma \in \gamma_{<r}G_{x,r}$. Thus $\gamma_{<r}G_{x,r} \cap (G' \cap \operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x})) \neq \emptyset$. If $r < \infty$, then the intersection is open in G', hence contains a semisimple element, say γ'. If $r = \infty$, then γ belongs to the intersection and is semisimple, so we may take $\gamma' = \gamma$. Then $(\underline{\gamma}, x)$ is also an r-approximation to γ'. By Lemma 9.2, there is $k \in [\underline{\gamma}; x, r]$ such that $({}^k\gamma_i)_{0 \leq i < r}$ is a normal r-approximation to γ'. By Corollary 6.14, ${}^k Z_G^{(r)}(\gamma) = Z_G^{(r)}(\gamma') \subseteq Z(C_G(\gamma')^\circ) \subseteq G'$.

For the 'if' direction, suppose that $x \in \mathcal{B}_r(\gamma)$ and $Z_G^{(r)}(\gamma) \subseteq {}^{[\gamma;x,r]}G'$. By Definition 9.5, $Z_G^{(r)}(\gamma)\gamma \cap G_{x,r} \neq \emptyset$. Therefore, $\gamma \in ({}^{[\gamma;x,r]}G')G_{x,r}$, so there is $k \in [\gamma; x, r]$ with $\gamma \in ({}^kG')G_{x,r} = {}^k(G'G_{x,r})$. By Remark 6.10(3), ${}^{k^{-1}}\gamma \in \gamma G_{x,r}$. Thus $\gamma \in G'G_{x,r}$. Since $x \in \mathcal{B}_r(\gamma)$, we have by Lemma 9.6 that $\gamma_{\geq r} \in G_{x,r} \subseteq \operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x})$ and by Remark 6.10(2) that $\gamma_{<r} \in \operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x})$; so in fact $\gamma \in G'G_{x,r} \cap \operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x}) = (G' \cap \operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x}))G_{x,r}$.

For the 'if' direction, it remains to prove that, if $Z_G^{(r)}(\gamma)\gamma \cap G_{x,r} \neq \emptyset$, $Z_G^{(r)}(\gamma) \subseteq {}^{[\gamma;x,r]}G'$, and $\mathbf{G}'/Z(\mathbf{G}')$ is F-anisotropic, then $x \in \mathcal{B}_r(\gamma)$. From Remark 6.10(1), for each $0 \leq i < r$, there is $k_i \in [\gamma; x, r]$ so that ${}^{k_i}\gamma_i \in G'$. In particular, since $\mathbf{G}'/Z(\mathbf{G}')$ is F-anisotropic and $x \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{G}', F)$, we have that ${}^{k_i}\gamma_i$, hence also γ_i, acts by a translation on x. Since γ_i is bounded modulo center, in fact it fixes the image $\overline{x}$ of x in $\mathcal{B}^{\text{red}}(\mathbf{G}, F)$. If $i > 0$, then $\mathrm{d}_x({}^{k_i}\gamma_i) = \mathrm{d}({}^{k_i}\gamma_i)$, so also $\mathrm{d}_x(\gamma_i) = \mathrm{d}(\gamma_i) = i$; i.e., $\gamma_i \in G_{x,i}$. If $r < \infty$, then, by applying Lemma 7.6 repeatedly, one sees that x belongs to $\mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\gamma), F)$. If $r = \infty$, then $\mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\gamma), F) = \mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r')}(\gamma), F)$ for $r' < \infty$ sufficiently large, so again $x \in \mathcal{B}(C_{\mathbf{G}}^{(r)}(\gamma), F)$. By Definition 9.5, since we knew already that $Z_G^{(r)}(\gamma)\gamma \cap G_{x,r} \neq \emptyset$, this means that $x \in \mathcal{B}_r(\gamma)$. □

Corollary 9.16. *With the notation and hypotheses of Proposition 9.14,* $\gamma \in {}^{G_{x,0+}}\big((G' \cap \operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x}))G_{x,r}\big)$ *if and only if* $\gamma_{<r} \in {}^{G_{x,0+}}G'$.

Proof. Suppose that $\gamma \in {}^{G_{x,0+}}\big((G' \cap \operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x}))G_{x,r}\big)$. Upon replacing γ by a $G_{x,0+}$-conjugate, we may, and hence do, assume that $\gamma \in (G' \cap$

$\operatorname{stab}_G(\overline{x}))G_{x,r}$. By Proposition 9.14, $\gamma_{<r} \in Z_G^{(r)}(\gamma) \subseteq {}^{k^{-1}}G' \subseteq {}^{G_{x,0+}}G'$ for some $k \in [\gamma; x, r]$.

On the other hand, suppose that $\gamma_{<r} \in {}^{G_{x,0+}}G'$. Upon replacing γ by a $G_{x,0+}$-conjugate, we may, and hence do, assume that $\gamma_{<r} \in G'$. Then $Z_G^{(r)}(\gamma) = Z(C_G(\gamma_{<r})^\circ) \subseteq G'$. Since $x \in \mathcal{B}_r(\gamma)$ (either directly from the hypothesis, or from Lemma 9.13 if $\mathbf{G}'/Z(\mathbf{G}')$ is F-anisotropic), certainly $Z_G^{(r)}(\gamma)\gamma \cap G_{x,r} \neq \emptyset$ (by Definition 9.5). By another application of Proposition 9.14, $\gamma \in \operatorname{stab}_{G'}(\overline{x})G_{x,r}$. ☐

APPENDIX A. GENERALITIES ON REDUCTIVE GROUPS

In this section, F is an arbitrary field and $\mathbf{G}$ is a connected reductive F-group. The following results might already be known, but we were unable to find references.

Lemma A.1. *Let $\mathbf{T}$ be an F-torus, and $\mathbf{S}$ a closed (not necessarily connected) F-subgroup of $\mathbf{T}$. Then there is an F-subtorus $\mathbf{T}' \subseteq \mathbf{T}$, split over the splitting field of $\mathbf{T}/\mathbf{S}$, such that $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{T}'\mathbf{S}$.*

Proof. Note that $\mathbf{S}^\circ$ is a torus. From Proposition 1.8 of [9], there is an F-torus $\mathbf{T}' \subseteq \mathbf{T}$ such that $\mathbf{T}'\mathbf{S}^\circ = \mathbf{T}$ and $\mathbf{T}' \cap \mathbf{S}^\circ$ is finite. Thus, $\mathbf{T}'\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{T}$ and $\mathbf{T}' \cap \mathbf{S}$ is finite. Therefore $\mathbf{T}/\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{T}'\mathbf{S}/\mathbf{S} \cong \mathbf{T}'/(\mathbf{T}' \cap \mathbf{S})$ is isogenous to $\mathbf{T}'$, so Corollaire 1.9(a) of [9] implies that the splitting fields of $\mathbf{T}'$ and $\mathbf{T}/\mathbf{S}$ are the same. ☐

Corollary A.2. *Suppose that*

- *$\mathbf{S}$ is an F-torus in $\mathbf{G}$,*
- *$\mathbf{N}$ is a closed F-subgroup of $Z(\mathbf{G})$, and*
- *$\mathbf{S}/(\mathbf{N} \cap \mathbf{S})$ is F-split.*

Then $C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S})$ is an F-Levi subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$.

Proof. From Lemma A.1, there is an F-split torus $\mathbf{S}'$ such that $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{S}'(\mathbf{N} \cap \mathbf{S})$. Then $C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S}) = C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S}')$, which is an F-Levi subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$. ☐

Lemma A.3. *If $\mathbf{N}$ is a closed F-subgroup of $Z(\mathbf{G})$ and $\gamma \in Z(\mathbf{G})(\overline{F})$ belongs to a torus which is F-split modulo $\mathbf{N}$, then γ belongs to every maximal F-split modulo $\mathbf{N}$ torus.*

Proof. By Corollaire 1.9 of [9], a torus is F-split modulo $\mathbf{N}$ if and only if it is F-split modulo $\mathbf{N}^\circ$. Thus we may, and hence do, assume that $\mathbf{N}$ is connected. By Proposition 22.4 of [7], the map $\mathbf{G} \longrightarrow \mathbf{G}/\mathbf{N}$ is central. Let $\mathbf{T}$ be a maximal F-split modulo $\mathbf{N}$ torus such that $\gamma \in \mathbf{T}(\overline{F})$, and let $\mathbf{T}'$ be any other maximal F-split modulo $\mathbf{N}$ torus. In particular, by maximality, $\mathbf{T}$ and $\mathbf{T}'$ contain $\mathbf{N}$. By Theorem 22.6 of [7], the images $\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}$ and $\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}'$ of $\mathbf{T}$ and $\mathbf{T}'$, respectively, in $\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{N}$ are maximal F-split tori there. Thus, by Theorem

20.9 of [7], there is $\overline{g} \in (\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{N})(\overline{F})$ such that ${}^{\overline{g}}\widetilde{\mathbf{T}} = \widetilde{\mathbf{T}}'$. (In fact, $\overline{g}$ may be chosen in $(\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{N})(F)$.) This means that $\overline{\gamma} = {}^{\overline{g}}\overline{\gamma} \in \widetilde{\mathbf{T}}'(\overline{F})$, where $\overline{\gamma}$ is the image in $\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{N}$ of γ. Thus γ belongs to $(\mathbf{N}\mathbf{T}')(\overline{F}) = \mathbf{T}'(\overline{F})$, as desired. $\square$

Definition A.4. Let $\gamma \in G$ be semisimple. Then the *root values of* γ *for* $\mathbf{G}$ are the elements of $\bigl\{\alpha(\gamma) \bigm| \alpha \in \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})\bigr\}$, and the *character values of* γ are the elements of $\bigl\{\chi(\gamma) \bigm| \chi \in \mathbf{X}^*(\mathbf{T})\bigr\}$, where $\mathbf{T}$ is any maximal torus in $C_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma)$.

Note that, by [7, Corollary 8.5], the character values of γ do not depend on the choice of $\mathbf{T}$ or $\mathbf{G}$, and thus can be defined even when $\mathbf{G}$ is non-connected and $\gamma \notin G^\circ$. We will not pursue this here.

Definition A.5. Recall from [45, §I.4.1] that a prime p is *bad* for a root system Φ if there is some (integrally) closed subsystem $\Phi_1 \subseteq \Phi$ such that $\mathbb{Z}\Phi/\mathbb{Z}\Phi_1$ has p-torsion; and that p is *bad* for $\mathbf{G}$ if it is bad for the absolute root system for $\mathbf{G}$ with respect to some (hence any) maximal torus.

The sets of bad primes for the irreducible root systems are given below.

Φ	bad primes for Φ
A_n	$\emptyset$
$\mathsf{B}_n, \mathsf{C}_n, \mathsf{D}_n$	$\{2\}$
$\mathsf{E}_6, \mathsf{E}_7, \mathsf{F}_4, \mathsf{G}_2$	$\{2, 3\}$
E_8	$\{2, 3, 5\}$

In general, a prime is bad for a root system Φ if and only if it is bad for some irreducible factor of Φ.

Definition A.6. We say that an element of $F^\times$ is *bad* for $\mathbf{G}$ if it is a non-trivial root of unity whose order has only bad primes for $\mathbf{G}$ as prime divisors. If $\gamma \in G$ is semisimple, and no root value of γ is bad for $\mathbf{G}$, then we say that γ *has only good root values* for $\mathbf{G}$.

Proposition A.7. *Suppose that* $\gamma \in G$ *is semisimple and has only good root values for* $\mathbf{G}$. *Then* $\mathbf{L} := C_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma)^\circ$ *is a Levi subgroup of* $\mathbf{G}$.

Moreover, let E *denote the minimal Galois extension of* F *such that* $\mathbf{L}$ *is an* E*-Levi subgroup of* $\mathbf{G}$*, and* E' *the extension of* F *generated by the root values of* γ *for* $\mathbf{G}$. *Then* E *contains* E'. *Suppose that no root value of* γ *for* $\mathbf{G}$ *is a non-trivial root of unity. Then* $E = E'$.

The proof is adapted and generalized from part of the proof of Theorem 4.14 of [34]. An early draft was discussed with Jonathan Korman.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{T}$ be a maximal F-torus in $\mathbf{G}$ such that $\gamma \in T$. To prove the first claim, it is enough to construct an F-torus $\mathbf{S} \subseteq \mathbf{T}$ such that $\mathbf{L} = C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S})$.

For a subset $\mathbf{Y} \subseteq \mathbf{X}^*(\mathbf{T})$, let $\mathbf{Y}^\perp \subseteq \mathbf{T}$ denote the intersection of the kernels of the elements of $\mathbf{Y}$. For a subgroup $\mathbf{T}' \subseteq \mathbf{T}$, let $\mathbf{T}'^\perp$ denote the lattice of characters in $\mathbf{X}^*(\mathbf{T})$ that are trivial on $\mathbf{T}'$.

Let $\Phi = \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$, $\Phi_\gamma = \{\alpha \in \Phi \mid \alpha(\gamma) = 1\}$, $\widetilde{\mathbf{S}} = \Phi_\gamma^\perp$, and $\mathbf{S} = \widetilde{\mathbf{S}}^\circ$. Since (by [45, §II.4.1(b)])

$$C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S}) = \langle \mathbf{T}, \mathbf{U}_\beta : \beta \in \mathbf{S}^\perp \cap \Phi \rangle$$

and

$$\mathbf{L} = \langle \mathbf{T}, \mathbf{U}_\alpha : \alpha \in \Phi_\gamma \rangle,$$

it will be enough to show that $\mathbf{S}^\perp \cap \Phi = \Phi_\gamma$.

We show that $\mathbf{S}^\perp \cap \Phi \subseteq \Phi_\gamma$, since the opposite containment is trivial. Put $m = |\widetilde{\mathbf{S}}/\mathbf{S}|$. For $\alpha \in \mathbf{S}^\perp \cap \Phi$, we have $m\alpha \in \widetilde{\mathbf{S}}^\perp = \Phi_\gamma^{\perp\perp}$, which contains $\mathbb{Z}\Phi_\gamma$ with finite index, so that some positive integer multiple of α lies in $\mathbb{Z}\Phi_\gamma$. Let n be the smallest positive integer such that $n\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}\Phi_\gamma$. Since Φ_γ is closed in Φ, n is by definition a product of bad primes. Since $(n\alpha)(\gamma) = 1$, we have that $\alpha(\gamma)$ is an nth root of unity. But γ has only good root values, so this implies that $\alpha(\gamma) = 1$, and thus that $\alpha \in \Phi_\gamma$.

It is clear that E must contain E'.

We now prove the final statement of the proposition. Let $\mathbf{Y}_\gamma$ denote the lattice of all characters in $\mathbb{Z}\Phi$ that are trivial on γ. Put $\widetilde{\mathbf{S}}' = \mathbf{Y}_\gamma^\perp$, and $\mathbf{S}' = (\widetilde{\mathbf{S}}')^\circ$. Then $\gamma \in \widetilde{\mathbf{S}}'$. Pick a positive integer n such that $\gamma^n \in \mathbf{S}'$. Our hypothesis on the root values of γ implies that for $\alpha \in \Phi$, $\alpha(\gamma^n) = 1$ if and only if $\alpha(\gamma) = 1$. Thus, by another application of [45, §II.4.1(b)], $C_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma)^\circ = C_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma^n)^\circ$. Since $\mathbf{S}' \subseteq \mathbf{S}$, we have that $\mathbf{L} = C_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma^n)^\circ \supseteq C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S}') \supseteq C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S}) = \mathbf{L}$, and thus that $\mathbf{L} = C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S}')$. Therefore, it is enough to show that $\mathbf{S}'/(Z(\mathbf{G})^\circ \cap \mathbf{S}')$ splits over E'.

In order to do so, we must show that for a Galois splitting field L of $\mathbf{T}$ over E', the group $\Gamma = \operatorname{Gal}(L/E')$ acts trivially on the lattice generated by the restrictions to $\mathbf{S}'$ of roots in Φ. That is, we must show that Γ acts trivially on $\mathbb{Z}\Phi/(\mathbb{Z}\Phi \cap \mathbf{S}'^\perp)$. Let $\sigma \in \Gamma$ and $\alpha \in \Phi$. By the construction of E', $\sigma(\alpha) - \alpha$ belongs to the lattice $\mathbf{Y}_\gamma$. Since $\mathbf{Y}_\gamma \subseteq \widetilde{\mathbf{S}}'^\perp \subseteq \mathbf{S}'^\perp$, we are finished. □

Lemma A.8. *Suppose that $\gamma \in G$ is semisimple. Then there is a positive integer n, not divisible by $\operatorname{char} F$, such that no character value of γ^n is a non-trivial root of unity.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{T}$ be an F-torus such that $\gamma \in T$, and put $X = \mathbf{X}^*(\mathbf{T})$, $Y = \{\chi \in X \mid \chi(\gamma) = 1\}$, and $n = |(X/Y)_{\mathrm{tor}}|$. Then no character value of γ^n is a non-trivial root of unity.

It only remains to show that n is not divisible by $p := \operatorname{char} F$. Indeed, suppose that $\chi \in X$ and $p\chi \in Y$. Then $\chi(\gamma)^p = 1$. Since $\overline{F}$ has no non-trivial pth roots of unity, $\chi(\gamma) = 1$, so $\chi \in Y$. That is, X/Y has no p-torsion, so p does not divide n. □

Lemma A.9. *Suppose that* $\mathbf{T}$ *is a torus, and* $\mathcal{S}$ *is any subset of* $\mathbf{T}$ *such that no character value of an element of* $\mathcal{S}$ *is a non-trivial root of unity. Then the Zariski closure of the group generated by* $\mathcal{S}$ *is a torus.*

Proof. Let $X = \mathbf{X}^*(\mathbf{T})$ and $Y = \left\{\chi \in X \,\middle|\, \chi(\gamma) = 1 \text{ for all } \gamma \in \mathcal{S}\right\}$. By assumption, X/Y is torsion free, so there is some lattice $X_0 \subseteq X$ such that $X = X_0 \oplus Y$. Let $\mathbf{S}$ denote the Zariski closure of the group generated by $\mathcal{S}$. By Corollary 8.5 and Proposition 8.7 of [7], there is an F-torus $\mathbf{S}' \subseteq \mathbf{T}$ such that $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{S}^\circ \times \mathbf{S}'$. Fix $\gamma \in \mathcal{S}$, and write $\gamma = \gamma_0\gamma'$, with $\gamma_0 \in \mathbf{S}^\circ$ and $\gamma' \in \mathbf{S}'$. Every character $\chi \in \mathbf{X}^*(\mathbf{S}')$ has a unique extension (which we will also denote χ) to $\mathbf{T}$ that is trivial on $\mathbf{S}^\circ$. Let $n = |\mathbf{S}/\mathbf{S}^\circ|$, so $\chi(\gamma)^n = 1$. By our assumption on $\mathcal{S}$, $\chi(\gamma) = 1$. Therefore, $\chi(\gamma') = \chi(\gamma)\chi(\gamma_0^{-1}) = 1$. Since this is true for all $\chi \in \mathbf{X}^*(\mathbf{S}')$, we have that $\gamma' = 1$; that is, $\gamma = \gamma_0 \in \mathbf{S}^\circ$. Thus $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{S}^\circ$; that is, $\mathbf{S}$ is connected. By Proposition 8.5 of [7], it is a torus. □

Corollary A.10. *Suppose that* $\gamma \in G$ *is semisimple, and that no character value of* γ *is a non-trivial root of unity. Then* $C_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma)$ *is an* E*-Levi subgroup of* $\mathbf{G}$*, where* E *is the extension of* F *generated by the root values of* γ*.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{S}$ denote the Zariski closure of the group generated by γ. Then $\mathbf{S}$ is a torus by Lemma A.9, so $C_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma) = C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S})$ is a Levi subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$. By Proposition A.7, it is actually an E-Levi subgroup. □

Lemma A.11. *If* $\mathbf{M}$ *is an* F*-Levi subgroup of* $\mathbf{G}$*,* $\mathbf{T}$ *is an* F*-split torus in* $\mathbf{G}$*, and* $\mathbf{D}$ *is a subvariety of* $\mathbf{M} \cap \mathbf{T}$ *defined over* F*, then* $\mathbf{D}$ *is contained in an* F*-split torus in* $\mathbf{M}$*.*

Of course, we may take $\mathbf{D}$ to be $\mathbf{M} \cap \mathbf{T}$ if that variety is defined over F (in particular, if F is perfect).

Proof. Put $\mathbf{H} = C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{D})^\circ$, which is defined over F by Corollary 9.2 (and Proposition 1.2) of [7] and reductive by [45, §II.4.1(b)]. Let $\mathbf{S}$ be the F-split part of the center of $\mathbf{M}$, so that $\mathbf{M} = C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S})$. Then $\mathbf{S}$ and $\mathbf{T}$ are F-split tori in $\mathbf{H}$. Upon enlarging $\mathbf{T}$ if necessary, we may, and hence do, assume that it is a maximal F-split torus in $\mathbf{H}$. Thus, there is $h \in H$ such that $\mathbf{S} \subseteq {}^h\mathbf{T}$. Then ${}^h\mathbf{T}$ is an F-split torus that is contained in $C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S}) = \mathbf{M}$ and contains ${}^h\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{D}$. □

For the remainder of this appendix, suppose that $\mathbf{G}$ is F-quasisplit, and $\mathbf{H}$ is a reductive F-subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$ of the same absolute and F-split ranks as $\mathbf{G}$.

Lemma A.12. *We have that* $\mathbf{H}$ *is* F*-quasisplit, and that* $\mathbf{H}$ *and* $\mathbf{G}$ *have the same* E*-split rank for every extension* E/F*.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{S}$ be an F-split torus maximal in $\mathbf{H}$, hence in $\mathbf{G}$. Since $\mathbf{G}$ is F-quasisplit, the centralizer $\mathbf{T} := C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S})$ is a maximal torus in $\mathbf{G}$. Clearly $C_{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{S})$ is contained in $\mathbf{T}$ and contains a maximal torus in $\mathbf{H}$. Since $\mathbf{H}$ and $\mathbf{G}$ have the same absolute rank, $\mathbf{T} = C_{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{S})$. This implies that $\mathbf{H}$ is F-quasisplit.

Now let E/F be an extension. Then $\mathbf{S}$ is contained in a maximal E-split torus in $\mathbf{G}$. This torus is necessarily contained in $C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S}) = \mathbf{T}$, hence in $\mathbf{H}$. Thus, $\mathbf{G}$ and $\mathbf{H}$ have the same E-split rank. □

Lemma A.13. *Let* $\mathbf{S}$ *be a maximal* F*-split torus in* $\mathbf{H}$*, and fix* $a \in \Phi(\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{S})$*. If* $2a \in \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S})$*, then* $2a \in \Phi(\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{S})$*. The unique closed connected subgroup of* $\mathbf{H}$ *with Lie algebra the sum of the* a*- and* $2a$*-weight spaces in* $\operatorname{Lie}(\mathbf{H})$ *for the action of* $\mathbf{S}$ *equals the unique closed connected subgroup of* $\mathbf{G}$ *with Lie algebra the sum of the* a*- and* $2a$*-weight spaces in* $\operatorname{Lie}(\mathbf{G})$ *for the action of* $\mathbf{S}$*.*

Proof. Put $\mathbf{T} = C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S})$, a maximal torus in $\mathbf{G}$. Since $\mathbf{H}$ has the same absolute rank as $\mathbf{G}$, also $\mathbf{T} = C_{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{S})$, so $\mathbf{H}$ is also F-quasisplit.

We will use throughout this proof the following fact: If $\alpha \in \Phi(\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{T})$, then, since the α-weight space in $\operatorname{Lie}(\mathbf{G})$ is one-dimensional by Theorem 13.18(4b) of [7], the α-weight spaces in $\operatorname{Lie}(\mathbf{H})$ and $\operatorname{Lie}(\mathbf{G})$ are equal.

Choose a character α of $\mathbf{T}$ which restricts to a such that the α-weight space in $\operatorname{Lie}(\mathbf{H})$ is non-trivial. Since $\mathbf{G}$ is F-quasisplit, by Proposition 15.5.3(iii) of [44], any such character is of the form $\sigma\alpha$ for some $\sigma \in \operatorname{Gal}(F^{\text{sep}}/F)$. Since $\operatorname{Lie}(\mathbf{H})$ is $\operatorname{Gal}(F^{\text{sep}}/F)$-stable, for any $\sigma \in \operatorname{Gal}(F^{\text{sep}}/F)$, the $\sigma\alpha$-weight space in $\operatorname{Lie}(\mathbf{H})$ is also non-trivial, hence equal to the $\sigma\alpha$-weight space in $\operatorname{Lie}(\mathbf{G})$. Since the a-weight space in $\operatorname{Lie}(\mathbf{H})$, respectively $\operatorname{Lie}(\mathbf{G})$, is equal to the sum of the $\sigma\alpha$-weight spaces in $\operatorname{Lie}(\mathbf{H})$, respectively $\operatorname{Lie}(\mathbf{G})$, as σ runs over $\operatorname{Gal}(F^{\text{sep}}/F)$, in fact the a-weight spaces in $\operatorname{Lie}(\mathbf{H})$ and $\operatorname{Lie}(\mathbf{G})$ are the same.

If $2a \notin \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S})$, then the $2a$-weight spaces in $\operatorname{Lie}(\mathbf{H})$ and $\operatorname{Lie}(\mathbf{G})$ are both trivial. Otherwise, by another application of Proposition 15.5.3(iii) of [44], there is an element $\sigma \in \operatorname{Gal}(F^{\text{sep}}/F)$ such that $\alpha+\sigma\alpha \in \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$. By [44, §17], the irreducible factor of $\Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$ containing α and $\sigma\alpha$ is of type A_{2n}. By [10, §4.3], the α- and $\sigma\alpha$-weight spaces in $\operatorname{Lie}(\mathbf{G})$ do not commute. Since both weight spaces lie in $\operatorname{Lie}(\mathbf{H})$, so does their commutator. Since their commutator lies in (in fact, equals) the $(\alpha + \sigma\alpha)$-weight space of $\operatorname{Lie}(\mathbf{G})$, we have that the $(\alpha+\sigma\alpha)$-weight space of $\operatorname{Lie}(\mathbf{H})$ is non-trivial. Thus the $2a$-weight space of $\operatorname{Lie}(\mathbf{H})$ is non-trivial; i.e., $2a \in \Phi(\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{S})$. This is the first part of the lemma. Now an argument similar to the above shows that, actually, the $2a$-weight spaces of $\operatorname{Lie}(\mathbf{H})$ and $\operatorname{Lie}(\mathbf{G})$ are equal.

Thus the two Lie algebras mentioned in the statement of the lemma are equal, so the groups mentioned there are also equal. This is the second part of the lemma. ☐

The following geometric result is well known in case $\mathbf{H}$ is a maximal F-torus in $\mathbf{G}$.

Lemma A.14. *Suppose that*

- $\mathbf{H}$ *is connected;*
- $\mathbf{S}$ *is a maximal F-split torus in* $\mathbf{H}$*; and*
- $h \in \mathbf{H}(\overline{F})$ *and, for each* $a \in \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S}) \smallsetminus \Phi(\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{S})$ *with* $a/2 \notin \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S})$, $u_a \in \mathbf{U}_a(\overline{F})$.

Denote by $\mathsf{m}_{\mathbf{H}}$ *the multiplication map*

$$\mathbf{H} \times \prod_{\substack{a \in \Phi(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{S}) \smallsetminus \Phi(\mathbf{H},\mathbf{S}) \\ a/2 \notin \Phi(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{S})}} \mathbf{U}_a \longrightarrow \mathbf{G}$$

(the latter product taken in any order). Then $\mathsf{m}_{\mathbf{H}}$ *is injective, and* $\mathsf{m}_{\mathbf{H}}(h, (u_a)) \in G$ *if and only if* $h \in H$ *and* $u_a \in U_a$ *for* $a \in \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S}) \smallsetminus \Phi(\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{S})$.

Proof. Put $\mathbf{T} = C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S})$, a maximal torus in $\mathbf{G}$; and abbreviate $\mathsf{m}_{\mathbf{H}}$ to m. By Proposition 14.4(2a) and Corollary 14.14 of [7], the multiplication maps $\mathbf{T} \times \prod_{\beta \in \Phi(\mathbf{J},\mathbf{T})} \mathbf{U}_\beta \longrightarrow \mathbf{J}$ are open immersions for any connected reductive subgroup $\mathbf{J}$ of $\mathbf{G}$ containing $\mathbf{T}$. By Lemma A.13, if $\alpha \in \Phi(\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{T})$, then the root subgroups of $\mathbf{G}$ and $\mathbf{H}$ associated to α are the same, so we may write $\mathbf{U}_\alpha$ without ambiguity. By Proposition 14.5 and Remark 21.10(1) of [7], for $a \in \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S})$, $\mathbf{U}_a = \prod_{\alpha|_{\mathbf{S}} \in \{a, 2a\}} \mathbf{U}_\alpha$ (as varieties). Fix, temporarily, $\alpha \in \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$, and put $a := \alpha|_{\mathbf{S}}$. If $a \in \Phi(\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{S})$, then $\mathbf{U}_\alpha \subseteq \mathbf{H}$ is contained in the domain of m. If $a \notin \Phi(\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{S})$ and $a/2 \notin \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S})$, then $\mathbf{U}_\alpha \subseteq \mathbf{U}_a$ is obviously contained in the domain of m. If $a \notin \Phi(\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{S})$ but $a/2 \in \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S})$, then, by Lemma A.13, also $a/2 \notin \Phi(\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{S})$. Then $\mathbf{U}_\alpha \subseteq \mathbf{U}_{a/2}$ is contained in the domain of m. Thus there is an open subset $\mathbf{V} := \mathbf{T} \times \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{T})} \mathbf{U}_\alpha$ of the domain of m on which m is an open immersion. Moreover, the orbits of $\mathbf{V}$ under the action of $\mathbf{H}$ fill out the domain of m. Since m is $\mathbf{H}$-equivariant, we have that the differential of m at every point of its domain is an isomorphism. By Zariski's main theorem (see Corollaire 18.12.13 of [19]), m is an open immersion; in particular, it is injective.

Denote by $\mathbf{C}$ the image of m. (For example, if $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{T}$, then $\mathbf{C}$ is a translate of the 'big cell'.) Then m is an isomorphism onto $\mathbf{C}$, so $\mathbf{C}(F)$ is the image under m of the set of F-rational points in the domain of m, namely $H \times \prod_{\substack{a \in \Phi(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{S}) \smallsetminus \Phi(\mathbf{H},\mathbf{S}) \\ a/2 \notin \Phi(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{S})}} U_a$. The remainder of the result follows from the injectivity of m. ☐

Lemma A.15. *Suppose that E/F is a finite Galois extension of odd degree. If $\mathbf{G}$ splits over E, then ${}_F\Phi(\mathbf{G})$ is reduced.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{S}$ be a maximal F-split torus in $\mathbf{G}$ and put $\mathbf{T} = C_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S})$, a maximal F-torus in $\mathbf{G}$. If $\Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S})$ is not reduced, then, by [44, §17], $\Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T})$ has an irreducible factor of type A_{2n} for some n and $\operatorname{Gal}(E/F)$ acts non-trivially on the Dynkin diagram of A_{2n}. This implies that E/F has even degree, which is a contradiction. □

APPENDIX B. GENERALITIES ON CONCAVE FUNCTIONS

Let Φ be a root system in some $\mathbb{Q}$-vector space V. Put $\widetilde{\Phi} = \Phi \cup \{0\}$.

Definition B.1. Given $C \in \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}$ and functions $f_j : \widetilde{\Phi} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}$ for $j = 1, 2$, we define the function $(f_1 \vee f_2)_C : \widetilde{\Phi} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathbb{R}} \cup \{-\infty\}$ by

$$(f_1 \vee f_2)_C(\alpha) = \inf \left\{ \sum_m f_1(a_m) + \sum_n f_2(b_n) \right\} \quad \text{for } \alpha \in \widetilde{\Phi},$$

the infimum (in $\widetilde{\mathbb{R}}$) taken over all pairs of non-empty finite sequences $(a_m)_m$ and $(b_n)_n$ in $\widetilde{\Phi}$, both of length at most C, such that $\sum_m a_m + \sum_n b_n = \alpha$. Put $f_1 \vee f_2 = (f_1 \vee f_2)_\infty$.

It is straightforward to verify that, for any functions f_1 and f_2 as in Definition B.1, $f_1 \vee f_2$ is concave (in the sense of Definition 5.7) as long as $(f_1 \vee f_2)(\alpha) \neq -\infty$ for all $\alpha \in \widetilde{\Phi}$ (in particular, by the next result, as long as $(f_1 \vee f_2)(0) \neq -\infty$); and that a function $f : \widetilde{\Phi} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}$ is concave if and only if $f \vee f \geq f$.

Lemma B.2. *There is a constant $C(\Phi)$, depending only on Φ, with the following property. Fix functions $f_j : \widetilde{\Phi} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}$ for $j = 1, 2$. If $(f_1 \vee f_1)(0) \neq -\infty \neq (f_2 \vee f_2)(0)$ (in particular, if f_1 and f_2 are non-negative), then $f_1 \vee f_2 = (f_1 \vee f_2)_{C(\Phi)}$.*

Proof. Note that, in fact, $(f_j \vee f_j)(0) \geq 0$, so $f_j(0) \geq \frac{1}{2}(f_j \vee f_j)(0) \geq 0$, for $j = 1, 2$. Put $C(0) = 2\,|\widetilde{\Phi}|$ and $C(\alpha) = C(\Phi) = 3\,|\widetilde{\Phi}|$ for $\alpha \in \Phi$.

Fix $\alpha \in \widetilde{\Phi}$, and put $C = C(\alpha)$. We claim that there does not exist a pair of non-empty finite sequences $(a_m)_m$ and $(b_n)_n$ in $\widetilde{\Phi}$ such that $\sum_m a_m + \sum_n b_n = \alpha$ but

$$\sum_m f_1(a_m) + \sum_n f_2(b_n) < (f_1 \vee f_2)_C(\alpha).$$

Indeed, suppose there does exist such a pair, and let $((a_m)_m, (b_n)_n)$ be one of minimal total length, say ℓ.

Let $(c_p)_{0 \le p < \ell}$ be a sequence containing precisely the terms of $(a_m)_m$ and $(b_n)_n$, counted with multiplicities. Recall that $\alpha = \sum_{p=0}^{\ell-1} c_p \in \widetilde{\Phi}$. We claim that there is a permutation π of $\{0, 1, \dots, \ell - 1\}$ such that $c^{(i)} := \sum_{p=0}^{i-1} c_{\pi(p)} \in \widetilde{\Phi}$ for all $0 < i \le \ell$. By induction, it suffices to show that there is some index $0 \le p_0 < \ell$ such that $\alpha - c_{p_0} \in \widetilde{\Phi}$. If $\alpha = 0$, then any index p_0 will do. If $\alpha \ne 0$, then, since

$$\left\langle \alpha, \sum_{p=0}^{\ell-1} c_p \right\rangle = \langle \alpha, \alpha \rangle > 0,$$

there is some index p_0 such that $\langle \alpha, c_{p_0} \rangle > 0$. Then, by the corollary to Theorem VI.1.3.1 of [11], $\alpha - c_{p_0} \in \widetilde{\Phi}$.

Since, necessarily, $\ell > |\widetilde{\Phi}|$, there are indices $0 < i < i' \le \ell$ such that $c^{(i)} = c^{(i')}$, hence such that $\sum_{i \le p < i'} c_{\pi(p)} = 0$. That is, there is some proper subsequence of $(a_m)_m \cup (b_n)_n$ the sum of whose terms (with multiplicities) is 0. Let $(\gamma_q)_q$ be of maximal length among such subsequences. There are four cases.

1. The terms of $(\gamma_q)_q$ form a proper subsequence of the terms of $(a_m)_m$, or a proper subsequence of the terms of $(b_n)_n$ (counted with multiplicities).
2. The terms of $(\gamma_q)_q$ include some, but not all, of the terms of $(a_m)_m$, and some, but not all, of the terms of $(b_n)_n$ (counted with multiplicites).
3. The terms of $(\gamma_q)_q$ are precisely the terms of $(a_m)_m$, or precisely the terms of $(b_n)_n$ (counted with multiplicities).
4. The terms of $(\gamma_q)_q$ include all of the terms of $(a_m)_m$ and some (but, necessarily, not all) of the terms of $(b_n)_n$ (counted with multiplicites), or *vice versa*.

In case (1), if the first possibility obtains, let $(a_{m'})_{m'}$ be the subsequence of $(a_m)_m$ containing the terms of $(\gamma_q)_q$, and $(a_{m''})_{m''}$ the complementary subsequence. Then

$$\begin{aligned}(f_1 \vee f_2)_C(\alpha) &> \sum_{m'} f_1(a_{m'}) + \sum_{m''} f_1(a_{m''}) + \sum_n f_2(b_n) \\ &\ge \min\{f_1(0), (f_1 \vee f_1)(0)\} + \sum_{m''} f_1(a_{m''}) + \sum_n f_2(b_n).\end{aligned}$$

Since $\min\{f_1(0), (f_1 \vee f_1)(0)\} \ge 0$, we have

$$(f_1 \vee f_2)_C(\alpha) > \sum_{m''} f_1(a_{m''}) + \sum_n f_2(b_n),$$

contradicting the minimality of $((a_m)_m, (b_n)_n)$. The second possibility is handled similarly.

In case (2), let $(a_{m'})_{m'}$ be the subsequence of $(a_m)_m$ containing the terms it shares with $(\gamma_q)_q$, and $(a_{m''})_{m''}$ the complementary subsequence. Define $(b_{n'})_{n'}$ and $(b_{n''})_{n''}$ similarly. Then

$$\begin{aligned}(f_1 \vee f_2)_C(\alpha) &> \sum_{m'} f_1(a_{m'}) + \sum_{n'} f_2(b_{n'}) + \sum_{m''} f_1(a_{m''}) + \sum_{n''} f_2(b_{n''}) \\ &\geq (f_1 \vee f_2)(0) + \sum_{m''} f_1(a_{m''}) + \sum_{n''} f_2(b_{n''}).\end{aligned}$$

Since $(f_1 \vee f_2)(0) \geq 0$, we obtain a contradiction as before.

Suppose we are in case (3). Then $\sum_m a_m, \sum_n b_n \in \widetilde{\Phi}$. Necessarily, $(a_m)_m$ or $(b_n)_n$ has length greater than $|\widetilde{\Phi}|$; say $(a_m)_m$ does. (The other possibility is treated similarly.) By reasoning as above, we see that there is some proper subsequence $(a_{m'})_{m'}$ of $(a_m)_m$ such that $\sum_{m'} a_{m'} = 0$. Let $(a_{m''})_{m''}$ be the complementary subsequence. Then

$$\begin{aligned}(f_1 \vee f_2)_C(\alpha) &> \sum_{m'} f_1(a_{m'}) + \sum_{m''} f_1(a_{m''}) + \sum_{n} f_2(b_n) \\ &\geq \min\{f_1(0), (f_1 \vee f_1)(0)\} + \sum_{m''} f_1(a_{m''}) + \sum_{n} f_2(b_n).\end{aligned}$$

Since $\min\{f_1(0), (f_1 \vee f_1)(0)\} \geq 0$, we obtain a contradiction as before.

In case (4), if the first possibility obtains, let $(b_{n'})_{n'}$ be the subsequence of $(b_n)_n$ containing the terms it shares with $(\gamma_q)_q$, and $(b_{n''})_{n''}$ the complementary subsequence. If $\alpha = 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned}(f_1 \vee f_2)_C(\alpha) &> \sum_{m} f_1(a_m) + \sum_{n'} f_2(b_{n'}) + \sum_{n''} f_2(b_{n''}) \\ &\geq \sum_{m} f_1(a_m) + \sum_{n'} f_2(b_{n'}) + \min\{f_2(0), (f_2 \vee f_2)(0)\}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\min\{f_2(0), (f_2 \vee f_2)(0)\} \geq 0$, we obtain a contradiction in the usual fashion. The second possibility is handled similarly. Thus we have shown that $(f_1 \vee f_2)_{C(0)}(0) = (f_1 \vee f_2)(0)$.

Now suppose $\alpha \neq 0$. If $(b_{n''})_{n''}$ had more than $|\widetilde{\Phi}|$ terms, then the usual argument would show that $(\gamma_q)_q$ was not maximal, which is a contradiction.

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}(f_1 \vee f_2)_C(\alpha) &> \sum_m f_1(a_m) + \sum_{n'} f_2(b_{n'}) + \sum_{n''} f_2(b_{n''}) \\ &\geq (f_1 \vee f_2)(0) + \sum_{n''} f_2(b_{n''}) = (f_1 \vee f_2)_{C(0)}(0) + \sum_{n''} f_2(b_{n''}) \\ &\geq (f_1 \vee f_2)_{C(0)+|\widetilde{\Phi}|}(\alpha) = (f_1 \vee f_2)_C(\alpha),\end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. Again, the second possibility is handled similarly.

We have shown that $(f_1 \vee f_2)(\alpha) \geq (f_1 \vee f_2)_C(\alpha) \geq (f_1 \vee f_2)_{C(\Phi)}(\alpha)$. The reverse inequality is obvious. Since $\alpha \in \widetilde{\Phi}$ was arbitrary, we have the desired equality of functions. □

Lemma B.3. *For any function $h : \widetilde{\Phi} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}$ and any $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, put*

$$h_\delta(\alpha) = \begin{cases} h(\alpha), & h(\alpha) \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}, \\ r + \delta, & h(\alpha) = r+, r \in \mathbb{R} \end{cases}$$

for $\alpha \in \widetilde{\Phi}$. Fix functions $f_j : \widetilde{\Phi} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathbb{R}}$ for $j = 1, 2, 3$ such that $f_1 \vee f_2 \geq f_3$. Then $f_{1,\delta} \vee f_{2,\delta} \geq f_{3,\delta}$ for $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ sufficiently small. If also $(f_1 \vee f_2)(\alpha) > f_3(\alpha)$ whenever $f_3(\alpha) \neq \infty$, then $f_{1,\delta} \vee f_{2,\delta} \geq f_{3,\delta} + \varepsilon$ for $\delta, \varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ sufficiently small.

Proof. Consider the set of all $r - s$, where $r, s \in \mathbb{R}$ with $s < r$ are such that there exist non-empty finite sequences $(a_m)_m$ and $(b_n)_n$ in $\widetilde{\Phi}$, each of total length no more than $C(\Phi)$, such that

- $\sum_m f_1(a_m) + \sum_n f_2(b_n) \in \{r, r+\}$;
- $\alpha := \sum_m a_m + \sum_n b_n \in \widetilde{\Phi}$; and
- $f_3(\alpha) \in \{s, s+\}$.

(Here, $C(\Phi)$ is as in Lemma B.2.) This is a finite set of positive real numbers. Let c be its minimum. We claim that the first inequality holds whenever $\delta \leq c$, and the second holds (if $(f_1 \vee f_2)(\alpha) > f_3(\alpha)$ whenever $f_3(\alpha) < \infty$) whenever $\varepsilon \leq \delta \leq c/2$. Indeed, fix $\delta \leq c$ and any $\alpha \in \widetilde{\Phi}$.

If $f_3(\alpha) = \infty$, then $(f_1 \vee f_2)(\alpha) = \infty$, so

$$(*) \qquad (f_{1,\delta} \vee f_{2,\delta})(\alpha) \geq (f_1 \vee f_2)(\alpha) = \infty = f_{3,\delta}(\alpha) + (c - \delta).$$

Now suppose that $f_3(\alpha) \in \{s, s+\}$ with $s \in \mathbb{R}$. By Lemma B.2, there exists a pair $(a_m)_m$ and $(b_n)_n$ of non-empty finite sequences in $\widetilde{\Phi}$, each of length no more than $C(\Phi)$, such that $\sum_m a_m + \sum_n b_n = \alpha$ and $\sum_m f_{1,\delta}(a_m) + \sum_n f_{2,\delta}(b_n) = (f_{1,\delta} \vee f_{2,\delta})(\alpha)$.

If some $f_1(a_m)$ or $f_2(b_n)$ is ∞, then $(f_{1,\delta} \vee f_{2,\delta})(\alpha) = \infty \geq f_{3,\delta}(\alpha)$.

If all $f_1(a_m)$ and $f_2(b_n)$ are in $\mathbb{R}$ and $\sum_m f_1(a_m) + \sum_n f_2(a_n) = s$, then $f_3(\alpha) = s = (f_1 \vee f_2)(\alpha)$ and

$$(\dagger) \qquad (f_{1,\delta} \vee f_{2,\delta})(\alpha) = \sum_m f_1(a_m) + \sum_n f_2(b_n) = s = f_{3,\delta}(\alpha).$$

If all $f_1(a_m)$ and $f_2(b_n)$ are in $\mathbb{R}$ and $\sum_m f_1(a_m) + \sum_n f_2(a_n) > s$, then

$$(**) \quad (f_{1,\delta} \vee f_{2,\delta})(\alpha) = \sum_m f_1(a_m) + \sum_n f_2(b_n) \geq s + c \geq f_{3,\delta}(\alpha) + (c - \delta).$$

Now suppose that some $f_1(a_m)$ or $f_2(b_n)$ is not in $\mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$; say $f_1(a_{m_0}) = d+$ with $d \in \mathbb{R}$. Since

$$\Bigl(d + \sum_{m \neq m_0} f_1(a_m) + \sum_n f_2(b_n)\Bigr)+ \geq (f_1 \vee f_2)(\alpha) \geq f_3(\alpha) \geq s,$$

we have $d + \sum_{m \neq m_0} f_1(a_m) + \sum_n f_2(b_n) \geq s$, hence

$$(\ddagger) \qquad (f_{1,\delta} \vee f_{2,\delta})(\alpha) \geq (d + \delta) + \sum_{m \neq m_0} f_1(a_m) + \sum_n f_2(b_n) \geq s + \delta \geq f_{3,\delta}(\alpha).$$

If further $(f_1 \vee f_2)(\alpha) > f_3(\alpha)$, then similar reasoning gives

$$(***) \qquad (f_{1,\delta} \vee f_{2,\delta})(\alpha) \geq f_{3,\delta}(\alpha) + \min\{c, \delta\}.$$

By $(*)$, $(\dagger)$, $(**)$, and $(\ddagger)$, we have $(f_{1,\delta} \vee f_{2,\delta})(\alpha) \geq f_{3,\delta}(\alpha)$. By $(*)$, $(**)$, and $(***)$, if $(f_1 \vee f_2)(\alpha) > f_3(\alpha)$ and $\varepsilon \leq \delta \leq c/2$, then we have $(f_{1,\delta} \vee f_{2,\delta})(\alpha) \geq f_{3,\delta}(\alpha) + \min\{c - \delta, \delta\} \geq f_{3,\delta}(\alpha) + \varepsilon$. ☐

INDEX OF NOTATION

$\widetilde{\mathbf{G}}$ §3.1
F^{sep} §3.2
F^{tame} §3.2
F^{un} §3.2
$\mathfrak{f}_F$ §3.2
$\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$ §3.2
U_φ §3.2
${}_F U_\varphi$ §3.2
$V_F(Z(\mathbf{G}))$ §3.2
$\widetilde{\Psi}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S})$ §3.2
$\Psi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S})$ §3.2
G_r §3.4
$G_{x,r}$ §3.4
$\mathrm{Lie}(G)_{x,r}$ §3.4
d_x §3.4
d §3.4
G_x §3.4
${}_{\mathbf{T}}G_{x,f}$ §5.2
$\vec{G}_{x,\vec{r}}$ §5.2
$\mathcal{G}_d^G$ §6
$C^{(r)}_{\mathbf{G}}(\underline{\gamma})$ §6
$Z^{(r)}_{\mathbf{G}}(\underline{\gamma})$ §6
$C^{(r)}_G(\underline{\gamma})$ §6
$Z^{(r)}_G(\underline{\gamma})$ §6
$(\mathbf{Gd}^{\mathbf{G}(E)})$ §6
$[\underline{\gamma}; x, r]^{(j)}$ §6
$[\underline{\gamma}; x, r]$ §6
$C^{(r)}_G(\underline{\gamma})$ §6
$Z^{(r)}_G(\underline{\gamma})$ §6
$[\![\underline{\gamma}; x, r]\!]^{(j)}$ §6
$[\![\underline{\gamma}; x, r]\!]$ §6
$\mathcal{B}_r(\gamma)$ §9
$C^{(r)}_G(\gamma)$ §9
$C^{(r)}_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma)$ §9
$Z^{(r)}_G(\gamma)$ §9
$Z^{(r)}_{\mathbf{G}}(\gamma)$ §9
$[\gamma; x, r]^{(j)}$ §9
$[\gamma; x, r]$ §9
$[\![\gamma; x, r]\!]^{(j)}$ §9
$[\![\gamma; x, r]\!]$ §9
$f_1 \vee f_2$ §B
h_δ §B

INDEX OF TERMINOLOGY

absolutely semisimple, Definition 4.11
admissible sequence (of numbers), Definition 5.8
affine root (unusual usage), §3.2
r-approximation, Definition 6.8

character values of a semisimple element, Definition A.4
compatibly filtered F-subgroup, Definition 4.3

filtration-preserving map, Definition 4.3

good element, Definition 6.1
good root values, Definition A.6
good sequence, Definition 6.6

Levi subgroup
    F-Levi subgroup, p. 15
    E-Levi F-subgroup, p. 15

(x, f)-positive, Definition 5.10
preserves filtrations, Definition 4.3

root values of a semisimple element, Definition A.4

sufficiently large field, Definition 5.5

F-tame, Definition 4.2
tame Levi sequence, Definition 5.3
tame reductive sequence, Definition 5.1

REFERENCES

[1] Jeffrey D. Adler, *Refined anisotropic K-types and supercuspidal representations*, Pacific J. Math. **185** (1998), no. 1, 1–32. MR **1653184 (2000f:**22019)

[2] Jeffrey D. Adler, Lawrence Corwin, and Paul J. Sally Jr., *Discrete series characters of division algebras and GL_n over a p-adic field*, Contributions to automorphic forms, geometry, and number theory (H. Hida, D. Ramakrishnan, and F. Shahidi, eds.), Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD, 2004, pp. 57–64. MR **2058603 (2005d:**22015)

[3] Jeffrey D. Adler and Stephen DeBacker, *Some applications of Bruhat–Tits theory to harmonic analysis on the Lie algebra of a reductive p-adic group*, with appendices by Reid Huntsinger and Gopal Prasad, Michigan Math. J. **50** (2002), no. 2, 263–286. MR **1914065 (2003g:**22016)

[4] ———, *Murnaghan–Kirillov theory for supercuspidal representations of tame general linear groups*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **575** (2004), 1–35. MR **2097545 (2005j:**22008)

[5] Jeffrey D. Adler and Loren Spice, *Supercuspidal characters of reductive p-adic groups* (2007), available at `arXiv:0707.3313`.

[6] John Boller, *Characters of some supercuspidal representations of p-adic $\mathrm{Sp}_4(F)$*, Ph. D. Thesis, The University of Chicago, 1999.

[7] Armand Borel, *Linear algebraic groups*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 126, Springer–Verlag, New York, 1991. MR **1102012 (92d:**20001)

[8] A. Borel and T. A. Springer, *Rationality properties of linear algebraic groups. II*, Tôhoku Math. J. (2) **20** (1968), 443–497. MR 0244259 (39 #5576)

[9] Armand Borel and Jacques Tits, *Groupes réductifs*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. (1965), no. 27, 55–150 (French). MR 0207712 (34 #7527)

[10] ———, *Homomorphismes "abstraits" de groupes algébriques simples*, Ann. of Math. (2) **97** (1973), 499–571 (French). MR 0316587 (47 #5134)

[11] Nicolas Bourbaki, *Lie groups and Lie algebras. Chapters 4–6*, Elements of Mathematics (Berlin), Springer–Verlag, Berlin, 2002 (English). MR **1890629 (2003a:**17001)

[12] François Bruhat and Jacques Tits, *Groupes réductifs sur un corps local*, Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. **41** (1972), 5–251 (French). MR 0327923 (48 #6265)

[13] ———, *Groupes réductifs sur un corps local. II. Schémas en groupes. Existence d'une donnée radicielle valuée*, Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. **60** (1984), 197–376 (French). MR **756316 (86c:**20042)

[14] Lawrence Corwin, Allen Moy, and Paul J. Sally Jr., *Supercuspidal character formulas for GL_ℓ*, Representation theory and harmonic analysis (Cincinnati, OH, 1994), 1995, pp. 1–11. MR **1365530 (96m:**22037)

[15] Stephen DeBacker, *On supercuspidal characters of GL_ℓ, ℓ a prime*, Ph. D. Thesis, The University of Chicago, 1997.

[16] ______, *Some applications of Bruhat–Tits theory to harmonic analysis on a reductive p-adic group*, Michigan Math. J. **50** (2002), no. 2, 241–261. MR **1914064 (2003g:**22018)

[17] ______, *Parametrizing nilpotent orbits via Bruhat–Tits theory*, Ann. of Math. (2) **156** (2002), no. 1, 295–332. MR **1935848 (2003i:**20086)

[18] Paul Gérardin, *Sur les représentations du groupe linéaire général sur un corps $\mathfrak{p}$-adique*, Séminaire Delange-Pisot-Poitou (14e année: 1972/73), Théorie des nombres, Fasc. 1, Exp. No. 12, 1973, pp. 24 (French). MR 0396858 (53 #718)

[19] Alexander Grothendieck, *Éléments de géométrie algébrique. IV. Étude locale des schémas et des morphismes de schémas IV*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. (1967), no. 32, 361 (French). MR 0238860 (39 #220)

[20] Thomas C. Hales, *A simple definition of transfer factors for unramified groups*, Representation theory of groups and algebras (J. Adams, R. Herb, S. Kudla, J.-S. Li, and R. Lipsman, eds.), Contemporary Mathematics, vol. 145, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1993, pp. 109–134. MR **1216184 (94e:**22020)

[21] David Kazhdan, *On lifting*, Lie group representations. II (R. Herb, S. Kudla, R. Lipsman, and J. Rosenberg, eds.), Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1041, Springer–Verlag, Berlin, 1984, pp. 209–249.

[22] Ju-Lee Kim and Fiona Murnaghan, *Character expansions and unrefined minimal K-types*, Amer. J. Math. **125** (2003), no. 6, 1199–1234. MR **2018660 (2004k:**22024)

[23] Robert E. Kottwitz, *Isocrystals with additional structure. II*, Compositio Math. **109** (1997), no. 3, 255–339. MR **1485921 (99e:**20061)

[24] Philip C. Kutzko, *On the supercuspidal representations of* Gl_2, Amer. J. Math. **100** (1978), no. 1, 43–60. MR 0507253 (58 #22411a)

[25] Erasmus Landvogt, *A compactification of the Bruhat–Tits building*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1619, Springer–Verlag, Berlin, 1996. MR **1441308 (98h:**20081)

[26] Serge Lang, *On quasi algebraic closure*, Ann. of Math. (2) **55** (1952), 373–390. MR 0046388 (13,726d)

[27] Allen Moy, *Displacement functions on the Bruhat–Tits building*, The mathematical legacy of Harish-Chandra (Robert S. Doran and V. S. Varadarajan, eds.), Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics, vol. 68, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2000, pp. 483–499. MR **1767906 (2001h:**22022)

[28] Allen Moy and Gopal Prasad, *Unrefined minimal K-types for p-adic groups*, Invent. Math. **116** (1994), no. 1–3, 393–408. MR **1253198 (95f:**22023)

[29] ______, *Jacquet functors and unrefined minimal K-types*, Comment. Math. Helv. **71** (1996), no. 1, 98–121. MR **1371680 (97c:**22021)

[30] Fiona Murnaghan, *Characters of supercuspidal representations of* $\mathrm{SL}(n)$, Pacific J. Math. **170** (1995), no. 1, 217–235. MR **1359978 (96k:**22030)

[31] ______, *Local character expansions and Shalika germs for* $\mathrm{GL}(n)$, Math. Ann. **304** (1996), no. 3, 423–455. MR **1375619 (98b:**22020)

[32] Gopal Prasad and Jiu-Kang Yu, *On finite group actions on reductive groups and buildings*, Invent. Math. **147** (2002), no. 3, 545–560. MR **1893005 (2003e:**20036)

[33] Michael Rapoport, *The reduction of the Shimura variety associated to a torus*. Unpublished.

[34] Alan Roche, *Types and Hecke algebras for principal series representations of split reductive p-adic groups*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **31** (1998), no. 3, 361–413 (English, with English and French summaries). MR **1621409 (99d:**22028)

[35] Guy Rousseau, *Immeubles des groupes réductifs sur les corps locaux*, Ph. D. Thesis, Univ. Paris XI, 1977.

[36] Paul J. Sally Jr. and Joseph A. Shalika, *Characters of the discrete series of representations of* $\mathrm{SL}(2)$ *over a local field*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **61** (1968), 1231–1237. MR 0237713 (38 #5994)

[37] Jean-Pierre Serre, *Local fields*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 67, Springer–Verlag, New York, 1979 (English). MR **554237 (82e:**12016)

[38] ———, *Lie algebras and Lie groups*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1500, Springer–Verlag, Berlin, 1992. MR **1176100 (93h:**17001)

[39] ———, *Galois cohomology*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer–Verlag, Berlin, 2002 (English). MR **1867431 (2002i:**12004)

[40] Hideo Shimizu, *Some examples of new forms*, J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA Math. **24** (1977), no. 1, 97–113. MR 0447121 (56 #5436)

[41] Allan J. Silberger, PGL_2 *over the* p*-adics: its representations, spherical functions, and Fourier analysis*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 166, Springer–Verlag, Berlin, 1970. MR 0285673 (44 #2891)

[42] Loren Spice, *Supercuspidal characters of* SL_ℓ *over a* p*-adic field,* ℓ *a prime*, Amer. J. Math. **127** (2005), no. 1, 51–100. MR **2115661 (2005k:**22028)

[43] ———, *Topological Jordan decompositions*, J. Algebra, to appear, available at `arXiv:math.GR/0612475`.

[44] Tonny A. Springer, *Linear algebraic groups*, Progress in Mathematics, vol. 9, Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 1998. MR **1642713 (99h:**20075)

[45] Tonny A. Springer and Robert Steinberg, *Conjugacy classes*, Seminar on Algebraic Groups and Related Finite Groups. (Held at The Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, NJ, 1968/69) (A. Borel and R. Carter, eds.), Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 131, Springer–Verlag, Berlin, 1970, pp. 167–266. MR 0268192 (42 #3091)

[46] Jacques Tits, *Reductive groups over local fields*, Automorphic forms, representations and L-functions. Part 1 (A. Borel and W. Casselman, eds.), Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics, vol. XXXIII, American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1979, pp. 29–69. MR **546588 (80h:**20064)

[47] André Weil, *Basic number theory*, 2nd edition, Springer–Verlag, New York, 1973.

[48] Jiu-Kang Yu, *Construction of tame supercuspidal representations*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **14** (2001), no. 3, 579–622 (electronic). MR **1824988 (2002f:**22033)

[49] ———, *Smooth models associated to concave functions in Bruhat–Tits theory* (2002), preprint. Version 1.3.

THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON, AKRON, OH 44325-4002
Current address: American University, Washington, DC 20016-8050
E-mail address: `jadler@american.edu`

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, ANN ARBOR, MI 48109-1043
E-mail address: `lspice@umich.edu`